Provenance, Journal of the Society of Georgia Archivists

Volume 20 | Number 1 Article 11

January 2002

Provenance XX

Susan G. Broome
Mercer University

PROVENANCE

volume XX, 2002

The Ursuline Library—Presenting and Interpreting History through a Partnership with The Historic New Orleans Collection

Editorial Staff

PROVENANCE

Journal of the Society of Georgia Archivists

Volume XX, 2002

CONTENTS

 ISSN 0739-4241.

Provenance is published annually by the Society of Georgia Archivists. Potential contributors should consult the Information for Contributors found on the final pages of this issue. Inquiries regarding advertising rates should be sent to the Managing Editor, *Provenance*, SGA, P.O. Box 133085, Atlanta, GA 30333, or via the SGA web site <http://www.soga.org>. For back orders of previous issues of *Provenance*, please contact the Editor, SGA, P.O. Box 133085, Atlanta, GA 30333, or via the SGA web site <http://www.soga.org>.

Annual memberships: Individual, $25; Student, $10; Couple, $20; Contributing, $25; Sustaining, $35; Patron, $50 or more. *Georgia Archive*, Volumes I–X (1972–1982), is available in 16 mm roll film or in microfiche, five volumes per set. *Provenance*, Volumes I–XIII (1983–1995), is available in 35 mm roll film. For microfilm inquiries, please contact Administrative Assistant, SGA, P.O. Box 133085, Atlanta, GA 30333, or via the SGA web site <http://www.soga.org>. Membership correspondence should be addressed to the Administrative Assistant, SGA, P.O. Box 133085, Atlanta, GA 30333, or via the SGA web site <http://www.soga.org>. Subscription correspondence should be addressed to the Subscription Manager, SGA, P.O. Box 133085, Atlanta, GA 30333, or via the SGA web site <http://www.soga.org>.

Cover: Courtesy of The Historic New Orleans Collection.

Provenance and the Society of Georgia Archivists assume no responsibility for statements made by contributors.

The paper in this journal is of an acid-free, high-quality stock, with a pH rating of 8.5–9, in accordance with the guidelines for permanence and durability of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity of the Council of Library Resources.

This issue of *Provenance* was published in January 2004.

Thirty and Counting: A Personal Perspective on the Journal of the Society of Georgia Archivists

Ellen Garrison

Fifty-seven issues. Two hundred and sixty-three articles. Four thousand four hundred and twelve pages. No matter how impressive, those numbers alone cannot tell the story of *Georgia Archive* and its successor *Provenance*. The numbers simply represent the dreams, ideas, and hard work of the journal's editors, staff, and editorial board members and the commitment of the Society of Georgia Archivists to the journal through thick and thin in its thirty-year history.

David B. Gracy II established the journal in 1972 to "serve all who work with Georgia's archival resources."[1] He planned to publish both descriptions of repositories with collections of interest to academic scholars and features that would "enhance the skills of Georgia's growing community of archivists." During his five-year tenure, Gracy did publish occasional articles about Georgia records in out-of-state repositories and

[1] David B. Gracy II, "An Introduction," *Georgia Archive*, 1, no. 1 (Winter 1972):2.

regular reports of new accessions by Georgia repositories.[2] However, by 1977 papers presented at meetings of the many new regional archival associations and other articles on archival topics dominated the journal's pages.

A 1974 *Georgia Archive* article by Archivist of the United States James B. Rhoads, exploring the growth of these new organizations, explains why the priorities of the journal had changed so quickly. According to Rhoads, the new regional associations had developed to provide an outlet for the interests and skills of the host of recent entrants into the profession and "a mechanism for talent to surface."[3] SGA's fledgling journal met the same need, offering budding authors a venue in which to begin their careers with help from the journal's staff. It also provided a link between the increasingly complex profession and its practitioners in the region. In fall 1975 *Georgia Archive* became the only regional archival publication to receive the Award of Merit from the Society of American Archivists for its contribution to the profession.

Ann Pederson, the journal's second editor, continued David Gracy's practice of working with sometimes inexperienced authors to bring new viewpoints and ideas to the archives profession, solidifying the role that the journal would play in the burgeoning world of archival publishing.[4] Although this proved to be a daunting task, one that demanded much of the journal's staff, subsequent editors honored Pederson's pledge. Over the next twenty-five years, many archivists whose work would later enliven the pages of national journals made their

---

[2] The last article about collections that documented Georgia history appeared in the summer 1976 issue of *Georgia Archive*. Thereafter even articles dealing with Georgia records focus on archival problems and practices, not on the research potential of the records.

[3] James B. Rhoads, "Central or Local Control: The Case for an Archical Partnership," *Georgia Archive*, 2, no. 1 (Winter 1974): 31.

[4] Pederson also gave the journal a new look with custom layouts, typeset pages, and illustrations. Modifications of appearance and production methods over the years have been another hallmark of the journal, which is now produced by computer and carries an illustration on its cover.

first appearance in print in the pages of *Georgia Archive* or *Provenance*.[5]

By 1979 a beleaguered Pederson, faced with dwindling financial resources and "too much work for too few willing hands," experienced the journal's first crisis. She responded by seeking unsuccessfully an institutional sponsor and expressed the journal's willingness to relocate and change editor in return.[6] When a membership poll in spring 1979 gave a clear mandate to continue publishing and strengthen the journal, two ideas went forward: 1) broaden the journal's acceptance through a name change and 2) explore cooperative publication arrangements with other archival groups.[7]

Meanwhile, members of SGA soldiered on to safeguard the contribution that the society's journal made to the archival profession. The journal long had followed contemporary issues and the new editor, Linda Matthews, continued that practice thereby insuring that *Georgia Archive* would continue to be a bridge between national concerns and archivists in the region. The journal had long followed contemporary archival issues,[8] and this tradition continued in the 1980s. First local records, then outreach took center stage in the journal's pages, followed by documentation strategy, non-textual records, and functional appraisal. An examination of the then-new SPINDEX system had appeared in 1980, and automation has proved to be a pe-

---

[5] *Georgia Archive* encouraged the creation of additional regional publications by featuring an article on the new Society of Southwestern Archivists and its newsletter in 1976, the same year *Midwestern Archivist* (later renamed *Archival Issues*) also first appeared.

[6] Ann Pederson, "*Georgia Archive* in Crisis," *Georgia Archive*, 7, no.1 (Spring 1979): iii.

[7] The next year two different regional organizations independently approached SGA about the possibility of copublication, but no agreement was reached after lengthy negotiations.

[8] This emphasis began with the 1977 issue, which featured three perspectives on the debate then raging over the proper place of the "activist archivist," a topic *Provenance* revisited in a 1987 issue that included a follow-up article by one of the original contributors.

rennially popular topic with the journal's contributors[9] as have archival education and the work of its practitioners and participants.

The journal's editors have always solicited contributions among archival educators. *Georgia Archive* first published a student paper in 1977, and seventeen years later essays by students of guest editor Richard Cox (who was himself one of the journal's earliest and most prolific contributors) filled a special double issue of the journal (1994-1995). In another effort to nurture fledgling professionals, the editorial board has recently created "Fresh Focus," a feature proposed by David Gracy specifically for work by archival students.

The year 1982 found the society in healthier financial condition, and its membership reaffirmed support for the journal[10] and changed the journal's name to *Provenance* to reflect a new regional orientation. The next issue on "Archives in the Southeast" featured both an examination of the recently completed state needs assessment grants by the director of the National Historic Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) and comments on the "problems and prospects for archives" in the region by colleagues from five neighboring states. These efforts brought to light a wealth of talent in the southeast, but a formal copublication arrangement among the southeastern state organizations never developed.

Sheryl Vogt, who became the journal's longest-serving editor to date (1985-1989, 1993, 1996-2001), used a variety of methods to attract up-and-coming authors. While associate editor she created "Short Features," a section that provided a forum for describing research and grant projects, sharing methodological innovations, circulating literature reviews, and offering professional observations and opinions that enlarged the pool of potential contributors. When she became editor she continued the position of associate editor who worked intensely with

---

[9] An exceptionally prescient 1985 article on the impact of technology on archives would seem right at home in this issue, so accurate were its predictions.

[10] Sheryl B. Vogt, "The Society of Georgia Archivists: Twenty Years of Meeting Archival Needs in Georgia," *Society of Georgia Archivists: 20 Years in Celebration, 1969-1989* (Atlanta: SGA, 1989), 71.

one or two authors to develop their manuscripts. She and her successor Margery Sly (1990-1992) also actively recruited board members from other southeastern states in order to entice contributors and extend the journal's scope and audience.

Archival publications, in general, have had difficulty attracting submissions since the early 1990s, and journal editors no longer had the luxury of simply waiting for material to arrive. So Vogt along with David Klassen, editor of the *American Archivist*, developed and led a series of workshops at meetings of the Society of American Archivists (SAA) designed to encourage archivists to write for publication. Representatives from the *Archival Issues* editorial board later joined the team in leading similar workshops at regional meetings. Theme issues[11]proved to be a particularly effective way to bring previously unpublished contributors, many from outside the field of archives, to the journal's readers.

Today SGA board members and *Provenance* staff troll meetings of national, regional, and local archival associations, as well as gatherings of related information professions and historical associations, for prospective articles. They also send letters and flyers to the growing cadre of archival educators and interrupt conversations at professional social events to suggest that a colleague's idea "would make a great article for us."

Occasionally in recent years the lack of material has even resulted in lapses in the journal's production schedule. During this period *Provenance*, like other national and regional publications, has had to reduce the number of issues published annually. At times members of the society almost feared that the oldest regional archival journal in America, and the only one published by a single state organization, might not survive to see its next anniversary.

Georgia Archive/Provenance has endured, however, because of the willingness of its editors to adapt the journal's format and content to the changing needs of its readers and the ability of the journal's staff to nurture contributors from a variety of backgrounds and skill levels. The editors and the journal

---

[11] Topics have included local records (1980), computers and archives (1981), outreach (1982), case files (1983), education (1984), information technology (1985), ethics (1993), and international archives (2000/2001).

staff have also shared a dedication to their work as mentors and to the flexibility and tenacity such dedication demands.

A commitment to link archivists in the southeast to national developments and issues through a professional journal has been a hallmark of the Society of Georgia Archivists for thirty years. I have been privileged to be part of that adventure for most of those years. During that time the other members of the staff and editorial board and I have always regarded our labors first and foremost as a service to the society and to the archival profession.

Now our successors have begun another thirty years in the same spirit. We wish them well. May they find as much satisfaction in their journey as we did in ours. And may they continue to enjoy support of the society's entire membership. The journal cannot survive with anything less.

Ellen Garrison is an associate professor of history at Middle Tennessee State University where she is developing courses in archival administration. She published her first article in the third issue of *Georgia Archive*, became the journal's book review editor in 1977, and has served as a member of its staff or editorial board ever since. During her term as editor from 1982 to 1984, she oversaw the conversion of the journal from *Georgia Archive* to *Provenance*.

Satisfaction and Skills We Gain as Archivists Are Not Ours to Keep

Susan G. Broome

A year ago *Provenance* was in triage, and the executive board of the Society of Georgia Archivists (SGA) had health care power of attorney. A robust journal, fed by the careful attention of outgoing editor Sheryl Vogt, her staff, and the editorial board, was floundering. Transfusions from other leaders were in order, but an extended search for a new attending physician had not been successful. A sense of despair and resignation was felt by many who had invested their lifeblood in the publication. There was talk of letting it die with dignity, but there was a critical need to evaluate its viability before making such a final decision. The absence of an attending physician hardly seemed reason enough to come to a hasty conclusion that might later seem ill-advised. A frank discussion among the family members was called for, something no one relished.

The current *Provenance* was birthed as *Georgia Archive* in 1972, destined to serve as a regional publication where no others existed at the time. Early leaders had a vision that looked beyond state borders. The Society of Georgia Archivists was committed to providing professional literature to students and archivists, as well as publishing opportunities to first-time and seasoned authors. It also developed archival education programs and concerned itself with mentoring archivists. The cost of providing these resources was seen as reasonable, and there was a strong commitment to the underlying ideals.

Over the years, the journal evolved into quite a professional enterprise, but it also hit some rough spots. Publication was dropped from twice yearly to once, and even that was difficult to maintain on a regular basis. SGA considered linking the journal with those in other archival organizations, but concluded that there were adequate resources to maintain it in its present form. The organization excelled in offering training opportunities to archivists with varying levels of experience, and it received grants to work on collaborative projects that would benefit archives statewide.

Still, mentoring writers and editorial board staff and members declined under the heavy load of production. Institutional support for professional activities did not always match the needs for leadership. Demands on archivists' time increased, making major commitments to offices in SGA (and the work of the nominating committee) more difficult. The need for competent professional literature never faltered, but a difference of opinion grew between those who valued the printed word and those who valued workshops and annual meetings.

The family meeting was sobering. The conversation allowed open debate over several issues and recognized the consensus that the earlier ideals of SGA had not been forgotten or turned aside. The family members came to the discussion from a position of strength. Membership, basic leadership, and funding were stable. It was agreed that the cost of producing the journal was a minor issue. The journal's purpose was service, not making a profit.

Though the first priority of SGA is to work for the benefit of its dues-paying members, there was agreement that contributing to the larger archival community was a noble and worthwhile goal. Meeting more than the immediate needs of its membership was viewed as important.

There was also agreement that support of the publishing commitments and training opportunities of SGA should not be mutually exclusive. There is room for both to exist and to complement one another.

Although an attending physician was nowhere in sight, there was acknowledgment that interns and residents had much to contribute toward the health of the patient. Mentoring of writers had always been integral to the success of *Provenance*, yet there was also room for mentoring editorial board members, readers, and copy editors. Publication workshops could encourage a broader range of authors. Students in the fields of archives, history, and preservation could be accessed through the chairs of their degree programs. Board members with varying levels of expertise would teach one another about the process of producing professional literature. Not everyone in leadership needs to be an expert.

Make no mistake about this. The outcome of this family meeting was *not* determined before it began. Members did some genuine soul-searching. Communication was not always easy. Dying with dignity is still death, and in the final analysis the group was not willing to let the journal go that easily. Make no mistake about that either. Death would have been the easier choice.

An attending physician appeared down a very long hall. She had a quiet assurance that there was life left in *Provenance* and that there remained a purpose for its existence. She was equally certain that transfusions from a myriad of others would be necessary to ensure the successful recovery of the patient. A new editorial board is being formed from archivists old and new. They are being called on to monitor activities and research coming from surrounding states and archival education programs, searching for publishable materials. Efforts are being made to maintain close relationships with both inquirers and writers, as they wind their way through the maze of the publishing process. New readers are being invited to evaluate manuscripts. Editorial liaisons are being recruited from varying backgrounds. Publishing workshops will be offered.

In many ways, life is back to normal. And yet, there was that near-death experience. Life takes on new meaning in such circumstances. Those who aided in reviving the patient did not suffer from difficult conversations or hide from the commitments now required. We must look past the *process* of publishing and focus on the *people* involved. The satisfaction and skills we gain from our work as archivists are not ours to keep. They are for sharing and adding value to others' lives. *Prov-*

enance is not in triage anymore, nor in intensive care. You will find it on the blood donor list.

Susan G. Broome is head of special collections (Baptist and University archives) at Mercer University in Macon, Georgia. She served as president of the Society of Georgia Archivists prior to becoming the editor of *Provenance*.

Bringing *Provenance* to a Wider Audience

Linda Matthews

The journal of a professional association is an integral part of the public and educational mission of an organization. By its quality and relevance to current issues, a journal essentially confirms the group's professional stature and purpose. By publishing articles on new initiatives, noteworthy projects, legal and social issues, and emerging trends affecting archives, the journal of the Society of Georgia Archivists (SGA) contributes to the continuing education of its members, the development of new archivists, and the historical record of issues and research affecting the profession. *Provenance* is the major published record of the society and its service to the profession.

How can the Society of Georgia Archivists maintain the relevance of its journal, now thirty years in existence, as technology molds our working lives? When David B. Gracy II established the journal in 1972, archivists had little professional literature beyond the *American Archivist*. Professional literature is now much more readily available and more sophisticated. In looking toward the future, say the fiftieth anniversary of *Provenance*, should the journal continue in its present form? If not, how can we modify our journal to meet the needs of future professionals and to be part of the development and growth of the profession in the twenty-first century?

Looking at the need for ready access to information and the problem of obsolescence for an information publication that is too long in preparation and delivery, should we not be rethinking the method of delivering *Provenance*? Would the archives professional and others who need to know about archives be better served if *Provenance* were delivered as an electronic journal?

Just as technology has changed our daily working lives, so technology is changing the delivery of information sources in our field as in all others. While electronic books (e-books) have not caught on with the reading public or academic users, demand for electronic journals (e-journals) by scholars is increasing dramatically. E-journals give quick and easy access from remote locations to the latest journal articles. Students, faculty, and professionals receive more timely reading by this method than through the lengthy process of print publication. Many new journals are issued solely in electronic form, distributed by commercial vendors and organizations for a subscription fee or no fee, and cataloged and made available through library online catalogs.

Those archivists who work in libraries, either public or academic, are certainly aware of the trend toward e-journals. A recent study of academics in the sciences indicated that the popularity of e-journals for their professional literature, both for research and for keeping up with trends in the field, is growing steadily. While scientists may be at the head of the disciplines in adopting the new technology of electronic journals, the humanities and social sciences and the public at large are following along. A large study of "information-gathering habits of students and professors" conducted for the Digital Library Federation by Outsell, a research firm that analyzes trends in the information industry, reported that 75 percent of the respondents use e-journals. While most continued to have greater trust in print sources or go to print sources to confirm their findings, the majority of respondents went first to online sources in their studies and research.[1] Those who use the Internet know that online sources

[1] Scott Carlson, "Students and Faculty Members Turn First to Online Materials, Study Finds," *Chronicle of Higher Education,* 49, no. 8 (October 18, 2002): A37.

from reliable organizations, such as professional associations, libraries, and archives, are generally accepted as the most current and best available information. The Society of Georgia Archivists should examine these trends in thinking about the future of *Provenance* and whether the mission of the society and the journal could be well served through electronic publication.

I propose that the society consider making *Provenance* an electronic journal, issued only in electronic form. The journal could then publish case studies, reports on research in progress, and thought-provoking essays in a timely fashion to a much wider audience. Libraries are increasingly reluctant to subscribe to additional paper journals that take up valuable space on shelves and may have a limited audience. Individuals are equally loathe to house long journal runs, and quick access is more and more the major issue with researchers.

Obviously there are issues to be addressed in changing from print to electronic format. As with a print journal, there must be an editor and the production must have a base of operations, usually an institution. An editorial board would still need to establish policy, receive submissions, and make judgments on publication. The board and membership would need to decide how to distribute the journal—by subscription, available to members, or simply free from the SGA website? Who would set up the initial site for the journal? Programming, design, and setup would entail time and money. The journal would need to be housed on an institution's server. Ongoing maintenance, systems support, indexing, updating, and preservation of the electronic files would need to be addressed. Clearly these issues are not new. There are thousands of e-journals, some large and well known, others small association publications, that are being cataloged by libraries. The Research Libraries Group's electronic publication *DigiNews*, available through the group's website, gives current insights concerning preservation and other issues related to electronic publications.

The Society might wish to consider joining a consortial collection of e-journals, such as *Project Muse*. Begun at Johns Hopkins University as an electronic collection of publications from the Hopkins University Press and still based at Johns Hopkins, *Project Muse* now includes publications from more than sixty university presses and associations, most in the arts and sciences. The benefit of joining with *Project Muse* would be that the time and cost of digitizing, indexing, developing a search engine, and maintenance are handled by that project. While one must subscribe to *Project Muse* for a fee to gain access to the journals in its collections, the society could still maintain the journal through its website and provide access to its own journal free of charge, if negotiated with *Project Muse*. The society would need to submit *Provenance* to the Johns Hopkins project for review and acceptance, but similar association journals are already included.

How would the electronic publication of *Provenance* benefit the society and the profession at large? There are the obvious benefits to the readers and those involved in the production of the journal:

- Electronic publication should be more timely. Although there is still a time requirement for soliciting, reading, accepting, and editing manuscripts, the time for mounting the journal electronically would be minimal, once the site is established, compared to the work of preparation and mailing of the print journal.
- Electronic publishing would enhance the recognition and readership of *Provenance* by making it more visible and useful to readers throughout the world, likely increasing the number of submissions for publication.
- The full text of the journal from its first to current issues could be made fully searchable online.
- The journal could be created online just as it would look in print (not merely typed text), making it easily recognizable and easier to read.
- Users would be able to print those articles of immediate use without having to give shelf space to the whole issue or many issues.
- The production costs should be lower once the design and initial programming are completed.
- The Society of Georgia Archivists could be in the forefront of the archives world in making its journal accessible to a worldwide audience and searchable through the Web.

This proposal makes an assumption that the mission of the society and its journal is to promote the understanding, preservation, and professional management of archives to as broad an audience as possible. There may be other elements in the mission, such as providing a venue for publications by beginning professionals, which need to be considered. In examining the future of the journal on its thirtieth anniversary, a remarkable achievement and contribution to the profession, the society's executive board and the editorial board of *Provenance* should review and state a clear mission that is far-reaching. Does the current *Provenance* fit into that mission? Could *Provenance* as an electronic journal fulfill the society's mission for the future? Understanding our audience for the journal and the ways in which that audience will be accessing information is critical in planning the future of *Provenance.*

Linda Matthews is vice provost and director of libraries at Emory University. From 1982 until 2003, she was director of special collections at Emory. She is a past president of the Society of Georgia Archivists, has served on the Society of American Archivists (SAA) Council, and is an SAA Fellow.

"If at First You Don't Succeed": Blacksher, Menefee & Stein, A Second Appraisal

Carol Ellis and Russell James

Introduction

Processing large collections can present a challenge to archivists. When a large collection consists of case files from a law firm, issues can arise that few archivists have experience in managing. Despite the special concerns that must be addressed in managing a large collection of legal records, archivists have a strong interest in these collections because of the historical relevance of cases the firms handle or particular clients the firms represent.

The very nature of legal collections can present problems for archivists. Lawyers represent clients on a case-by-case basis, treating each independently. As a consequence, archivists will find that legal collections are made up of sub-collections. In addition, lawyers tend to generate large volumes of files that must be retained for long periods of time. Law firm staff responsible for managing these files are rarely knowledgeable or experienced in archival theory and practice. Understanding the filing system of the law firm is critical for archivists in their effort to gain control over the collection and prepare it for research use.

Besides handling the large volume of files and understanding the law firm's unique filing system, archivists also have to address issues such as changing corporate names, privacy, and confidentiality. This article will describe one such large, complex legal collection and how the University of South Alabama Archives (USA) met the challenges associated with acquisition, restricted access, arrangement, and description. A particular focus of the article is the appraisal process and the problems that necessitated a second appraisal.

Acquisition of Blacksher, Menefee & Stein Collection

The Blacksher, Menefee & Stein (BMS) law firm of Mobile, Alabama, was involved in some of Alabama's most important civil rights cases. Some of the firm's clients were locally renowned and some of their cases precedent-setting. A few of the firm's attorneys went on to serve as state legislators and judges or became notable in Alabama civil rights history. BMS was one of the few biracial law firms in the state of Alabama, and it acted as cooperating counsel with the Legal Defense Fund (LDF) of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). The LDF paid BMS maintenance fees and funded expert witnesses and deposition costs for civil rights cases in which it had an interest. BMS litigated important civil and human rights issues, such as prison reform, employment discrimination, school desegregation, single-member district voting, and voting discrimination.

In 1989 an industrious secretary from the law firm called Michael Thomason, director of the University of South Alabama Archives, informing him that BMS was disbanding. Aware that BMS had handled two of the state's most important civil rights cases, *Birdie Mae Davis et al. v. Board of School Commissioners of Mobile County* and *Wiley L. Bolden v. the City of Mobile,* Thomason contacted the firm and negotiated for the files to be transferred to the archives. Three hundred cubic feet of records were delivered to the repository in 100 three-cubic-foot storage boxes. The firm also provided USA with a box list inventory that its staff had prepared and used to locate records after the files had been transferred to internal storage.

Although accession of the collection occurred immediately upon its arrival at USA, some of the cases handled by the firm were still ongoing. Greg Stein, the only one of the three attorneys remaining in Mobile after the firm dissolved, informed USA about concerns related to attorney/client privilege and confidentiality. He stipulated that the collection be closed for ten years. Requests for access during this ten-year period would be decided on a case-by-case basis. Unsure of what the eventual disposition of the collection would be, USA stored the files in the archives' stacks in the same condition that the files were received from BMS.

Eleven years later, in 2000, Michael Thomason and Greg Stein agreed that the collection should be fully processed and made available for research. By this time only one case, *Birdie Mae Davis,* was still in the courts. Stein rescinded the stipulation on closure and gave USA control over the collection. However, it was agreed that, during the processing of the collection, materials pertaining to privacy and confidentially of individuals would be removed. Such materials included medical and divorce records. USA's primary interest in the collection remained only with the civil rights case files.

Original Appraisal

In establishing selection criteria to appraise the collection, Thomason advised Stein of the archives' goal to preserve Mobile's historically significant civil rights cases and Stein agreed. With the assistance of Stein and his former law partner Henry Brewster, and using the box inventory provided by the firm, a list of the most historically significant civil rights cases handled by BMS was compiled. Selection guidelines were outlined in a letter between USA and Greg Stein and became referred to as the Thomason/Stein retention schedule. The two agreed further that cases deemed sensitive due to privacy issues were to be destroyed.

To begin the selection process, USA Archivist Lisa Baldwin assembled a staff of two to work on the project. The archives has a small staff, with Baldwin being the only full-time employee. The director, Michael Thomason, is also a history professor at the university and therefore gives only a portion of his time to the archives. Other than Baldwin, the archives staff consisted of one part-time employee, one graduate assistant, a fluctuating staff of three or four undergraduate assistants and work-study students, and one dedicated, long-time volunteer. Baldwin chose the graduate assistant and the volunteer for the project because of their experience. A retiree, John Calametti, has a master's degree in history. He had been a volunteer at the archives for more than ten years and had organized a number of important collections. Carol Ellis, the graduate assistant, was studying for her master's degree in history. She had worked in the archives for three years, gaining experience in archival procedures.

The archivist and two project staff members met with the director to discuss the procedures. The group agreed to examine each box of material in the order shown on BMS's box inventory, selecting files based on the Thomason/Stein retention schedule. Selected materials were removed from the original boxes and placed in temporary storage units, pending final organization. The archivist provided supervision over the project and advised the project staff when questions arose. The final decision on which cases to retain rested solely with the archivist.

As Calametti and Ellis progressed through the selection process, they realized that the box inventory provided by BMS was inaccurate and that there were many more files and a much larger volume of materials which needed to be retained than initially thought. Law firm files tend to be voluminous and complex, and the files of BMS were no exception. Some of BMS's cases remained in the courts for ten years, one for more than twenty-five years. A case can have many parts, including pleadings, correspondence, research, depositions, medical and employment records, résumés of expert witnesses, court proceedings, and final settlements or court orders. Some case files within the firm's collection ranged from three inches to several feet thick.

In its routine administrative practices, BMS's staff transferred older material in ongoing and closed cases from the firm's current files to storage boxes for inactive files. This practice resulted in documentation about a legal case being dispersed among numerous boxes and in files stored out of sequence. Ellis and Calametti did not discover this problem, however, until more than halfway through the selection process.

The archivist preferred to review a case file in its entirety to determine whether the case should be retained. However, because some of the BMS files were incomplete or dispersed throughout the collection, cases that were at first judged to be of no value were later found to be notable and worth retaining. That meant some cases deemed inconsequential, with their files removed to temporary storage awaiting destruction, were found to be important after other parts of the file were located.

The large volume and complexity of BMS's legal records proved to be somewhat overwhelming to USA's small project staff. To move judiciously through the three hundred cubic feet of records meant that Ellis and Calametti could give only a cursory look at files or file folder titles and judge whether to keep or discard the file. Reviewing the original BMS boxed material sequentially, the archives staff worked for seven months wading through the large number of boxes. They examined cases individually, deciding which files were of historical significance and which to discard due to privacy and confidentiality. Initially unaware of the problem of scattered files, USA placed case material in temporary storage boxes in the order the files were removed from the larger collection. As the extent of the scattered files became more apparent, the concern with keeping the cases selected for retention in the original order lessened, precisely because the lack of original order was evident.

Approximately fifty case files, totaling about 155 cubic feet, were chosen for retention in the original appraisal. After the appraisal was completed and staff had removed the most important civil rights cases, arranging and describing the collection began. John Calametti, the volunteer, was assigned as the principal processor, primarily because of his experience. This permitted Lisa Baldwin, the archivist, to focus on the day-to-day operations of the archives. Months into processing the collection, Russell James, a graduate intern from the University of West Florida, joined the archives staff for the summer. James wanted more experience in processing and organizing collections. Toward that goal, the archivist assigned James to join Calametti in processing the BMS collection. As James processed individual cases within the collection, he discovered a few problems. First, some of the case files were incomplete, lacking seemingly important materials that should be in a legal case.

Included in this category were materials that were not essential for the case's continued retention (letters and intermediary pleadings) and materials which had to be found in order to justify the case's continued retention (original pleadings and court judgments). Second, certain of the retained cases contained medical files that gave privileged information about BMS clients or witnesses. Third, some cases had correspondence with letterhead showing two or more variations of the firm's name. These three problems, coupled with the confusion caused by the inaccurate box inventory and materials from cases being scattered among various boxes, led USA to conclude that a second appraisal was needed.[1]

CORPORATE NAMES

Before beginning the second appraisal, the issue of changing corporate names was explored. The various name changes would impact the description and cataloging of the collection and also were important for researchers to understand when reviewing the collection. Blacksher, Menefee & Stein was an example of a law firm whose name changed more than once. While continuity did exist due to the presence of James Blacksher, the firm was known by at least three other names during the period from 1975 to 1982, the time frame of most cases USA chose to retain. For the sake of consistency, the firm was accessioned as Blacksher, Menefee & Stein.

The project archivist discussed the evolution of the law firm with Greg Stein, one of the partners, to better understand and clarify the distinctions among the corporate names. Subsequently, the archivist decided that finding aids for the various cases would include an abstract noting the different names. The only name entered in the MARC record was that of Blackshear, Menefee & Stein.

---

[1] Leonard Rapport, "In the Valley of Decision: What to Do about the Multitude of Files of Quasi Cases," *American Archivist* 48, no. 2 (Spring 1985): 173. This article recommends a second appraisal for large collections of the type discussed here. Rapport writes about a second appraisal of a collection *after* it had been processed, shelved for years, and used by researchers. However, his philosophy and methodology for a second appraisal warrants reading by those dealing with second-appraisal issues.

Second Appraisal

The University of South Alabama Archives director, archivist, and project staff held many discussions on the BMS collection throughout the initial arrangement and description. When the problem of incomplete case files was discovered, the staff decided that a second appraisal was essential. The staff of USA also wanted to perform a second appraisal because of the extensive size and complex filing system for the collection. Staff wanted to be sure that they had not overlooked any valuable material in the initial appraisal. The archivist decided that if essential materials for a case were not recovered in the second appraisal, any incomplete cases would be removed from the collection and designated for disposal.

In undertaking the second appraisal, the archivist made a list of all cases selected for retention in the first appraisal. To that list Russell James added a description of the materials he noticed were missing from some of the cases. Carol Ellis and Russell James began the laborious process of sifting through each box again, while John Calametti continued organizing the cases that were complete. As potentially valuable new materials were found, they were set aside for consultation with the archivist. The Thomason/Stein retention guidelines were used again as the criteria for whether to keep the new case or return it to the box for future disposal. As the second appraisal continued and a new case was retained, its name was added to the list so that all staff would be cognizant of the addition.

The most time-consuming portion of the second appraisal was sifting through more than two hundred cubic feet of files again. Ellis and James reopened and reviewed each of the boxes of case files that were previously designated for discard. The sheer volume of material again forced project staff to look at file folder headings or satisfy themselves with a cursory review of portions of the case's files. The archivist identified specific cases that required a more thorough review. After the review of the box was exhausted and the pertinent files removed, the box was marked with the date in red permanent marker. The box was then re-designated for disposal. The second appraisal required considerably less time—several weeks rather than seven months for the first appraisal—because the team was looking only for those specific cases of civil rights importance that were overlooked or for particular case files that were missing.

Ellis and James worked full days on the second appraisal, compared to the first appraisal when project staff was only available to work part-time. They carefully sifted through each three-foot box, looking for documents relevant to 1) the missing materials from cases selected for retention and 2) cases that should have been retained in the original appraisal but had been overlooked for the reasons given earlier.

Because of the heightened attention to detail in the second appraisal, other materials not of a legal nature, but nonetheless important to Mobile's civil rights history, were found. One example was the records of the Social Justice Commission of the Archdiocese of Mobile. This organization grew out of the reforms of the Second Vatican Council (1960-1965) and was made up of local clergy and laity who helped lead the fight for human and civil rights in Mobile and throughout Alabama. The papers of the Catholic Social Services of Mobile were also located and retained because of the special importance of this collection to the city's civil rights history. These records found their way into the collection because James Blacksher had been associated with both groups. Also discovered were some personal files of one BMS attorney. The attorney was contacted and the materials returned to him.

After Ellis and James completed the second appraisal, the case list was reviewed. Those cases selected in the second appraisal were examined to see if any crucial case materials were missing. The staff determined that all materials identified as missing in the first appraisal had been found. They also located additional materials for other cases retained in the first appraisal. In addition, four new cases were selected for retention. In total the BMS collection yielded fifty-five cases that totaled 162 cubic feet of materials.

Privacy and Access

The second appraisal proved successful in more ways than had been anticipated. A policy for access to sensitive legal files was constructed. Archivists sometimes play a guessing game in regard to the kinds of information protected by privacy laws. National, state, and local laws are often contradictory or vague. The archivist may need to consult an attorney or the professional literature to determine the extent to which privacy laws affect a collection. Not every collection containing sensitive materials needs to be closed completely to research. William G. Rosenberg recently laid out a practical policy for the seeming contradiction between privacy and access:

> There are obviously good reasons why access to information of various sorts relating to an individual's private life needs to be restricted, but it would be a mistake to imagine that the protections uniformly prevent access . . . . Rarely, if ever, is the right to access, and hence the right to privacy[,] assured by deaccessioning personal files and returning them to the individual. . . . Under all regimes and I daresay in all cases, classification and declassification decisions are based on the familiar question of whether the documents under review contain information whose release would irreparably harm state or individual interests. In other words, they are decisions about content, even if the materials for entire institutions or agencies . . . are thought by definition to contain this kind of material.[2]

Privacy concerns came into play in quite a few of the BMS cases, both the ones retained and the ones not selected for retention. In fact, several law cases were not retained based strictly upon concerns for privacy. Nevertheless, USA determined that none of the retained BMS cases was to be restricted in its entirety because there were some sensitive materials among the files. Instead, restricted access was limited to only sensitive information such as medical or social security records of persons named within a case. Restrictions are noted in the finding aids. Researchers may examine cases in their entirety to identify trends; however, researchers may not reveal specific names of persons in the restricted files.

---

[2] William G. Rosenberg, "Politics in the (Russian) Archives: The 'Objectivity Question,' Trust, and the Limitations of Law," *American Archivist* 64, no. 1 (Spring/Summer 2001): 82-83.

Conclusion

Archivists know that collections are likely to come to them in an unorganized state. Such was the case with the Blacksher, Menefee & Stein collection. Archivists also realize that the organic nature of collections necessitates careful appraisal. In this instance, the archivists had to pay attention to the types of cases handled and their content, as well as to the other representative materials present.

Archives strive to operate in a cost-efficient manner. Understanding the firm's record-keeping practices can save time and money during the appraisal process. Did the creating entity endeavor to keep case files together? Or were case files merely put into storage in the order in which they were removed from the firm's filing cabinets? Performing a second appraisal requires the expenditure of time by the archives' staff, but given the nature of large, unorganized legal collections and short of knowing how the collection was originally organized or having an exact inventory, the procedure may be the most cost-effective alternative.

Sensitivity and privacy issues are another challenge that can arise in processing legal collections. Archivists who accession, arrange, and organize law firm cases need to be aware that they may encounter materials of a confidential or private nature that should be restricted. Policies and procedures need to be implemented to regulate access to such files and enforce restrictions already in place. One method of addressing this problem is to close the records to research for ten years. Archivists may find, however, that some records, such as medical files, will require additional restrictions.

Archivists who process large law firm collections should conduct a second appraisal so that missing files can be located, overlooked materials can be saved, and privacy and confidentiality issues can be properly addressed. Pleasant surprises may also accompany a second appraisal. For example, the increased understanding of the firm and its work achieved during the first appraisal may result during the second appraisal in the discovery of historical records of a non-legal nature that meet the historical-content criteria for retention.

In a perfect archival world, a second appraisal would never be necessary. The file management practices at BMS, however, made it difficult to find all the relevant materials during the original appraisal. The incomplete condition of the original BMS box inventories and the prevalence of related materials strewn throughout the collection led the staff of USA to rethink the appraisal process in this instance. Although USA is unlikely to acquire another collection as large and complex as the legal collection of Blacksher, Menefee & Stein, its experience in the appraisal, arrangement, and description of the BMS collection proved invaluable and should benefit other repositories faced with appraising and processing similar collections.

Russell D. James is the archives and manuscripts librarian at the Billups-Garth Archives, Columbus-Lowndes Public Library, Columbus, Mississippi, and a history instructor at the Mississippi University for Women. He holds a master of arts degree in history from the University of West Florida.

Carol Ellis is a PhD candidate in history at Rice University in Houston. She holds a master of arts degree in history from the University of South Alabama.

What *Were* We Thinking?: A Call to Embrace Reappraisal and Deaccessioning

Mark A. Greene

Introduction

Mark Shelstad at the University of Wyoming has summed up the archival profession's apparent attitude toward deaccessioning by referring to it as "a word never to be uttered aloud."[1] If his observation is true, this article intends to help shatter the silence. I recommend that the archival profession embrace reappraisal and deaccessioning as basic, important, and effective collection management tools–integrally related to collecting policies, documentation goals, appraisal, space allocation, processing, and reference. Reappraisal and deaccessioning should be viewed as the archival equivalent of "mom and apple pie."

There has been a skimpy and sporadic, but fierce, theoretical argument within the profession over the legitimacy of reappraisal. This essay does not re-present or re-analyze that argument. Clearly, embracing reappraisal in practice requires acceptance (at some level) that such actions are theoretically sound.

---

[1] This was the title of Mark Shelstad's paper at the 1996 Society of American Archivists conference.

Instead, I have chosen to advance the discussion from the theory to the practice (and practicality) of reappraisal.

To accomplish this goal, four aspects of reappraisal and deaccessioning will be outlined. The first seeks to clarify the language used to describe reappraisal, by defining and redefining certain terms. The second sketches the very practical reasons that archivists need to accept reappraisal and deaccessioning as a normal and common part of their work. The third maps out the steps necessary to accomplish an effective reappraisal and deaccessioning project. The fourth briefly presents the origins and results of some specific reappraisal and deaccessioning projects at two institutions.

DEFINITIONS

It will be useful to define some relevant terms before proceeding further. The definition of reappraisal is easy—it means to appraise again. This is a bit misleading, however, because what we call reappraisal is often more accurately "appraisal." The fact that certain materials are in our collections does not guarantee that they were subject to meaningful appraisal when they were first acquired. Most simply, reappraisal is the application of collecting and appraisal criteria to materials already in the repository.

Deaccessioning is defined by the glossary of the Society of American Archivists (SAA) as "the process by which an archives or manuscripts repository formally removes material from its custody."[2] If this definition is accepted, each time a duplicate item is weeded from an archival record group, the processor is "deaccessioning." This defies common usage. A more useful and appropriate archival definition of deaccessioning would be "the process by which an archives or manuscripts repository formally removes a collection or record group from its custody."

Weeding is the traditional term for removing material below the collection level. Its SAA glossary definition is "removing individual documents or files lacking continuing value from a series."

---

[2] Lewis Bellardo and Lynn Lady Bellardo, *A Glossary for Archivists, Manuscript Curators, and Records Managers* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1992).

But wait. If deaccessioning means removing an entire collection, and weeding means removing items or folders, what do we call the removal of entire series or subgroups that lack continuing value from a collection? For want of an alternative, please consider a new term, "distillation," which literally means "to separate or extract the essential elements of."[3] There is good reason for this particular word choice. Judicious removal of series and subgroups no longer considered valuable in a record group can, in fact, result in a concentrated collection composed only of its essential elements.

A central argument, to be developed more fully below, is that weeding–removing material at the document or folder level–is almost never an efficient and effective use of resources in the context of reappraisal. Generally reappraisal should lead to distillation or deaccessioning to be a worthwhile investment of staff time.

Necessary evil or just necessary?

Most, if not all, archival repositories hold collections and major series within collections that staff members do not want and would never consider accepting now. This is the "stuff"[4] that causes archivists to shake their heads and ask: "What *were* we thinking when we took this in?" The materials are in our repositories, in large part, because appraisal is a subjective decision. It is based on a given institution's assessment of materials relative to contemporary archival practice; the institution's goals, clientele, and resources at a given moment in time; and the individual personalities and proclivities of any given set of staff.

---

[3] *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language,* 3rd Ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1992).

[4] I use the term "stuff" advisedly here. The *American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1979) defines "stuff" as "material not specifically identified," which aptly describes much of what we find on archival shelves.

Much more could be said about this, and has been;[5] but Maygene Daniels sums up the situation by saying: "Archival institutions . . . should anticipate that judgments will be made that later, in the light of future consideration or new information, may appear incorrect."[6] That is it in a nutshell—what might have made sense seventy-five, or even seven, years ago may not make sense today.

The sometimes-large amounts of "stuff" institutions hold that have no relationship to current missions and collecting policies are not simply mild inconveniences or occasional embarrassments. For most archivists, they are real and sometimes serious impediments to collecting new material that *does* fit the institution's mission and serve its clients. The presence of materials in a repository that have not been consciously identified as inappropriate and the lack of a clear collection policy may increase the likelihood of a repository's accepting *more* materials having a similar lack of purpose. Valuable space will be required for storage of these unwanted records, space the repository cannot afford to waste.

Conservation staff members can be overburdened by dealing with extraneous series in collections. Few, if any, repositories have sufficient conservation resources, and the potential for wasting those resources on material that is marginal or worse is untenable.

Those engaged in retrospective cataloging projects must devote limited resources to these materials or "leave them behind"

[5] The sharpest (and most cited) statement of this argument was made by Leonard Rapport, "No Grandfather Clause: Reappraising Accessioned Records," *American Archivist* 44, no. 2 (Spring 1981): 143-150, and Karen Benedict, "Invitation to a Bonfire: Reappraisal and Deaccessioning of Records as Collection Management Tools in an Archives—A Reply to Leonard Rapport," *American Archivist* 47, no. 1 (Winter 1984): 43-49. I have presented my view of the theoretical debates (albeit within the larger context of appraisal per se) in Mark A. Greene, "'The Surest Proof': The Use of Business Records and Implications for Appraisal," *Archivaria* 45 (Spring 1998): 127-169 (republished in Rand Jimerson, ed., *American Archival Studies: Readings in Theory and Practice* [Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2000], 301-344).

[6] Maygene Daniels, "Records Appraisal and Disposition," in *Managing Archives and Archival Institutions*, ed. James Bradsher (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1989), 66.

when migrating information into new catalog systems. It is difficult to rationalize maintaining collections that are *not accessible* through the current catalog, and it is equally difficult to make collections functionally accessible to researchers when the catalog is bloated by collections that are irrelevant to an institution's mission. Neither researchers nor reference staff are well served by their presence.

In short, the entire archival enterprise suffers when there is no method to reappraise and either deaccession or distill collections in a repository's holdings. A process *and* a policy to reappraise collections are needed "in order to more effectively cope with space and cost requirements as well as to strengthen and refine . . . holdings."[7]

Implementing Reappraisal and Deaccession-ing/Distillation

Three points need to be made about the execution of reappraisal and deaccessioning or distillation: (1) a repository should have a reasonably defined mission, collecting policy, and appraisal guidelines; (2) the task should be performed in a systematic rather than a haphazard manner; and (3) written policies and procedures are required.

Institutional Mission, Collecting Policy, Documentation Plans, Appraisal Guidelines. Reappraisal and deaccessioning only make sense intellectually as concepts if set against clear, formal, and realistic statements of institutional mission, broad collecting policy, and narrower appraisal guidelines. This is not the place for an extended discussion of mission statements and collecting policies—suffice it to say that it is difficult to make intelligent decisions about what to deaccession if it is unclear what should be acquired in the first place.

What does merit additional attention is the concept of *appraisal guidelines*. Appraisal guidelines identify types of documentation or formats that are especially sought or strongly avoided. Such guidelines are familiar to most archivists, at least in certain guises. For example, a county historical society without access to a computer would not likely choose to collect elec-

---

[7] Mark Shelstad, "Switching the Vacuum into Reverse: A Retrospective Conversion Project Case Study" (paper presented at the Society of American Archivists conference, San Diego, Calif., August 1996): 22.

tronic records. If neither its staff nor its clients have foreign language capabilities, a repository in the United States may only accept materials written in English. An archives lacking climate-controlled storage may not accept moldy documents.

More difficult and controversial is the development of appraisal guidelines based on the perceived importance or utility of certain record types or series. The Minnesota Historical Society (MHS), for example, has adopted appraisal guidelines that generally exclude financial ledgers and journals for twentieth-century businesses and organizations because their bulk is high and their use is low. Other MHS appraisal guidelines undergird the discussion below of that repository's distillation of United States congressional collections.

It is important to remember that collecting policies and appraisal guidelines—and any other acquisition or appraisal limits that are developed for a repository—should apply to both appraisal and reappraisal, at least in theory. In practice, for a variety of reasons, it may be inefficient or impolitic to apply them to reappraisal.[8]

Deaccession Policy and Distillation Procedures. Sensible and cautious archivists will have an institutionally-approved deaccession policy in writing before attempting reappraisal. In preparation for creating a formal deaccession policy, one should review the deaccession sections of the ethics statements of the International Council of Museums, the American Association of Museums, the Association of Art Museum Di-

---

[8] Although Terry Eastwood, as well as Karen Benedict, abjures applying appraisal criteria to reappraisal, see his "How Goes it with Appraisal?" *Archivaria* 36 (Autumn 1993): 111-121.

rectors, and the Association of Canadian Archivists.[9] Unlike the Society of American Archivists, all of these organizations have directly addressed the ethics and practice of deaccessioning.

As an example, the deaccession policy of MHS was drawn largely from the American Association of Museums statement and reads as follows:

> Deaccessioning is considered only for an item that meets one or more of the following conditions: (1) it is no longer relevant and useful to the mission of the Society; (2) it cannot be properly stored, preserved, or used; (3) it no longer retains its physical integrity, identity, or authenticity; and (4) it is unnecessarily duplicated in the collections. Deaccessioning can occur only when the item is clearly owned by the Society. Proof of ownership is not required to deaccession items that have negligible market value. . . .

---

[9] American Association of Museums, *Code of Ethics for Museums* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Museums, 1994), 8-9. See also, International Council of Museums (ICOM), *ICOM Code of Professional Ethics*_<http://icom.museum/ethics_rev_engl.html>; American Association of Museums, Curators Committee, "Code of Ethics for Curators," *Museum News* 62, no. 3 (February 1983): 38-40; American Association of Museums, Registrars Committee, "A Code of Ethics for Registrars," *Museum News* 64, no. 3 (February 1985): 42-46; Association of Art Museum Directors, "A Code of Ethics for Registrars," *Professional Practices in Art Museums* (New York: Association of Art Museum Directors, 1992), 8, 17-22. Members of the Association of Art Museum Directors found to have broken the code can be expelled from the organization and their museums could be suspended from borrowing materials or developing joint exhibits with other AAMD member museums. The International Committee for Documentation of the International Council of Museums (ICOM-CIDOC) has, in fact, developed specific information fields to document deaccessioning in collection management and cataloging systems: "Guidelines for Museum Object Information: Deaccession and Information Group," <http://www.willpowerinfo.myby.co.uk/cidoc/guide/guidedis.htm>. The Association of Canadian Archivists, "A Code of Ethics for Archivists in Canada," is on the web at <http://archivists.ca/publicat/general/code.htm>. The American Library Association does not mention deaccessioning in its code of ethics, but its Office for Intellectual Freedom created a *Workbook for Selection Policy Writing*, <http://www.ala.org/alaorg/oif/workbook_selection.html>, which notes that policies for "reevaluation (weeding)" are an essential part of a selection policy.

In disposing of items, the society must balance the interests of the public for which it holds the collection in trust, the donor's intent in the broadest sense, the interests of the scholarly and cultural community, and the institution's financial well-being. The society considers transfer of deaccessioned items, through gift, sale, or exchange, to other public institutions where they will continue to benefit the public and serve the purpose for which they were acquired. Proceeds from the sale of a deaccessioned item are used only for the acquisition or direct care of the society's collections.[10]

Distillation—the removal of series or subgroups from collections—can be considered a form of deaccessioning or not. An argument can be made for adopting slightly more liberal procedures for distillation because, unlike deaccessioning, distillation (1) does not necessarily remove a donor's gift from the collection; (2) rarely results in transfer of materials to another repository; and (3) rarely results in materials being put up for sale.

Holdings Review and Reappraisal. The processes of defining collecting policies and appraisal guidelines involve (among other things) reviewing the repository's current holdings. The review of holdings is necessary, not only for creating the policies and guidelines that are the basis for reappraisal, but because collections that make sensible targets for distillation and deaccessioning can be identified in a systematic way. As noted, reappraisal at its simplest is the application of collecting and appraisal criteria to material already in the repository. The actual decision to apply the criteria—to do the reappraisal and thus to reach the stage of actual distillation or deaccessioning—will be based on several factors. Among these are: (1) the "politics" of reappraisal, which for present purposes can be summarized as whether or not an archivist's administrative superiors are supportive of the process (note, though, that the archivist can exert a lot of influence by developing thoughtful and clear criteria and by making a practical case for implementation); and (2) the cost-benefit analysis, indicating whether implementing a reappraisal project will net a "gain" for the institution that is equal to or greater than the resources put into it. That gain

---

[10] Minnesota Historical Society, "Collections Management Policy" (September 1994): 8-9.

may be monetary from the occasional sale of deaccessioned collections, staff time not spent recataloging or providing reference service to irrelevant collections, or stack space increased by deaccessioning or distillation.

At MHS, it was not difficult to convince the administration of the need for reappraisal, but the payoff needed to be big (and the process was not applied to any individual collection that was considered a "political" problem). At that repository, it was informal policy to distill only those collections that could be reduced by 100 feet or more, a relative measurement based on total manuscripts holdings of 38,000 cubic feet. A repository with much smaller holdings could understandably set a lower benchmark.

It is important to note that reappraisal should not be approached originally at the level of individual collections, however. Implementing reappraisal piecemeal, one random collection after another, is highly inefficient, if not downright dangerous. It is inefficient because the internal processes necessary to accomplish deaccessioning or distillation can be "batched"—groups of accession files can be checked for any ownership or other problems that would preclude deaccessioning, or similar series of records in several collections can be reappraised and removed at the same time. It is dangerous because piecemeal deaccessioning or distillation greatly increases the risk that dramatically different decisions will be made from one collection or series to another—this endangers a rational collecting policy and may affect donor relations, if inconsistent reappraisal decisions must be explained. Absolute consistency is impossible, but a measure of consistency is necessary and can only be achieved by considering similar collections as part of a single project. To this end, reappraisal should generally be implemented broadly—if not to a repository's entire holdings, then to defined subsets (such as business records).

Accession File Review. Whether deaccessioning or distilling, it is essential to know exactly what rights the repository has for every reappraised collection and what the repository's relationship is to each donor. In general, only collections for which the repository has clear and unrestricted title, and which present no obvious donor complications, should be considered candidates for deaccessioning. *If* the donor agreement specifies that unwanted material be returned to the donor (or the heirs), the agreement should be honored to the letter. However, especially for distillations, it may be useful to contact the donor in advance, explain the impending procedure, and ask whether the donor still wants the material returned. The donor may choose to forego this step, though if so, the archivist must make every effort to get such an amendment to the agreement in writing.

The suggestion that donors be fully informed, even ahead of the actual reappraisal, may seem like folly at first glance. "Is he kidding?" many cautious archivists may ask. "If I let my donors know that we are reappraising their collections, I'll be tarred and feathered." In fact, extensive experience at MHS with reappraisal leading to distillation strongly suggests that donors—even those who are high-powered with presumably big egos—are more than willing to accept the need for reappraisal if it is presented clearly and as part of a well-conceived, well-planned, overall program. This is especially true when reappraisal can be presented to them as a method of increasing the usefulness and prominence of their collection by focusing attention on its most important elements.

Disposal. A written policy should specify what forms of disposition are acceptable once a collection has been deaccessioned or distilled. Shelstad notes the most common forms: "If deaccessioning has been determined to be appropriate, collections may be transferred to another repository, returned to the donor, destroyed, or offered for sale, with sale proceeds to be used for the sole purposes of acquisitions or preservation of other collections."[11] Experience at MHS suggests (and the repository's collection management policy requires) that material be returned to the donor only if the deed of gift requires it. Destruction is entirely appropriate for deaccessioned collections that are duplicated in another repository, physically unstable, illegible, or simply too fragmentary or insignificant to be of use to another repository. Return to donor and destruction should generally be the only options for material distilled from larger collections. The major exception to this would be large

[11] Mark Shelstad, "Switching the Vacuum into Reverse: A Case Study of Retrospective Conversion as Collection Management," *Archival Issues* 23, no. 2 (1998): 144.

runs of serials or caches of significant publications that might be offered to a library. Transferring entire deaccessioned collections to another repository can be time-consuming but reflects the best character of the archival enterprise. As a profession, archivists generally pride themselves on preserving materials so that they can be made accessible to the widest possible audience.[12] Selling items, on the other hand, usually consigns them to private hands and relative inaccessibility.

Still, it is difficult for a resource-poor repository to give away a small set of Lincoln letters, for example, when the hundreds of thousands of dollars they might bring at auction would increase the repository's acquisition budget by a factor of ten (or more). There are some possibilities for "middle ground" when it comes to monetarily valuable and historically significant collections once they have been deaccessioned. One option is to have the material appraised and then to negotiate a direct sale to an appropriate repository, even if for somewhat less than the items might fetch at open auction. Some repositories do have substantial acquisitions budgets or "angels" who will assist with important purchases. A similar approach is to have an auction house handle the sale, but establish specific provisions to give the advantage to repositories as buyers rather than individuals. The New York Historical Society did this when it permitted other New York repositories to pre-empt any final auction bid within fourteen days, at a 3-10 percent discount, plus the ability to pay in installments.[13]

Two Case Studies

Sketching the outlines of rational, efficient, and ethical reappraisal is easier than actually implementing such approaches. This is not, however, simply an intellectual exercise, but a foundation for action. Summaries of two projects at the Minnesota Historical Society will make this clear. The first describes the reappraisal and distillation of United States congressional collections, resulting in the removal of 1,000 cubic feet

---

[12] The *ICOM Code of Professional Ethics* strongly urges transfer of material to another repository rather than sale.

[13] Posting to the Archives and Archivists listserv, <http://listserv.muohio.edu/archives/archives.html>, Friday, 2 Dec. 1994, 09:28:49: Subject: New York Historical Society Sale of Deaccessioned Collections.

of material from the stacks. The second documents the reappraisal and deaccessioning of collections identified during a retrospective cataloging project, as well as a separate holdings review. This resulted in little gain of stack space, but in considerable goodwill and the knowledge that the institution's holdings now largely match the institution's collecting policy.

Distillation—The Congressional Collections. Until 1990 MHS was committed in practice to comprehensively and exhaustively documenting each and every congressperson in the state's delegation. Short of financial receipts and award plaques, every record generated by every congressional office was sought and retained. This practice resulted in the congressional collection alone totaling nearly 6,200 cubic feet, or approximately 16 percent of the institution's total manuscript collection. A full 95 percent of this 6,200 feet documented congressional activity since World War II; 82 percent (5,000 cubic feet) covered the period since 1960.

Without disputing the importance of these politicians to the history of Minnesota, it was debatable whether their importance was equivalent to the space and other resources they had traditionally occupied in the repository. As a colleague asked: "Do we really need 116 feet of material to document Congressman Tom Hagedorn's eight years in office when we keep 110 feet for nearly seventy years of the St. Paul Area United Way?"[14] For the society to have the ability to aggressively document communities of color, major Minnesota industries, women's groups, and all the other aspects of Minnesota history it wishes to see adequately represented in the manuscript collections, it was necessary to revise the traditional "take anything" approach to congressional papers. The most important steps taken were (1) to reject constituent correspondence and casework files from representatives and (2) to accept these

[14] Todd J. Daniels-Howell, "Appraisal of Congressional Papers" (paper presented at the Midwest Archives conference, Chicago, Ill., May 1991), 7.

series from senators only if the records were microfilmed or could be sensibly sampled.[15]

Having established these appraisal standards, MHS diverted internal funds and assigned a project staff position to six collections of representatives' papers. Working on six collections in direct sequence permitted the project archivist to build a level of expertise quickly and helped ensure uniformity across the reappraisals. The six collections represented a total of seventy years of congressional service. Before the reappraisal project, the collections totaled 1,536 cubic feet. After applying the new appraisal guidelines, 982 cubic feet—64 percent—of that total were removed and destroyed. In addition, by reducing the size of a typical representative's collection from 120 cubic feet to about 20 cubic feet, the processors were able to provide a much better level of arrangement and description to the collections.

Have relationships with donors been damaged? Has the quality of the collections been compromised? Todd Daniels-Howell answered those questions in an article analyzing the project:

> Experience so far tells us that we can safely answer no to both of these questions. Of the six collections that have been reappraised, the two largest did not have donor agreements allowing the Society to dispose of un-

---

[15] Constituent correspondence—also called issue mail—deserves some specific comment because it is far and away the bulkiest and most common material in the papers of late twentieth-century representatives and because our decision to reject it has caused the most controversy within archival circles. Several factors counter the wisdom of retaining the huge bulk represented by this series of records. First, even the most dedicated historians admit that no one can or wants to read all the letters received on a specific issue; most scholars use this series to find quotable examples. Second, neither historians nor the congressional offices themselves rely on issue mail as an indication of the strength of popular opinion on a specific issue; district and statewide polls, not mail or phone calls, are the means by which offices judge voter opinion. As the chief of staff of one of Minnesota's congressmen noted, while their mail ran 60-40 against gun control, polls in their district consistently showed 70 percent voter approval of gun control. In addition, he added: "Most of the letters we receive are inane, and so are most of the responses we send out." See Mark A. Greene, "Appraisal of Congressional Records at the Minnesota Historical Society: A Case Study," *Archival Issues* 19, no. 1 (1994): 35-36.

> wanted material. Before we could proceed, therefore, we had to contact the two former congressmen . . . to inform them of our intentions and to seek permission to destroy the material weeded from their collections. In both cases we sent copies of our appraisal guidelines and told them of our belief that this process would make their collections more accessible to researchers. Both men quickly gave consent to the destruction of unwanted materials and indicated that they completely trusted our judgment in these matters. The thoroughness of the appraisal guidelines conveys competence and thoughtfulness to donors, both past and present. And while there have been from the beginning those on the Society's staff who worry about researchers from the past returning to collections to find that what they once used, or cited in a publication, no longer exists . . . , at this admittedly early date, there have been no complaints whatsoever about the new shape of these collections.
>
> [W]e believe strongly that the Minnesota Historical Society appraisal guidelines, and in particular our reappraisal of collections using them, [have] made these collections stronger because of their greater accessibility and higher concentration of historically valuable materials . . . .[16]

The MHS project has served as a model for the American Heritage Center, University of Wyoming, which is beginning the analysis necessary to consider distilling sets of collections relating to economic geology and transportation. The center's consideration of congressional collections will begin shortly. It is not preordained that the resulting decisions will mirror those at MHS, however, because the mission, resources, and audience at the center are different.

Deaccessioning. Since approximately 1972, the Minnesota Historical Society has deaccessioned 370 manuscript collections. Approximately 200 of these deaccessions occurred in

---

[16] Todd Daniels-Howell, "Reappraisal of Congressional Records at the Minnesota Historical Society: A Case Study," *Archival Issues* 23, no. 1 (1998): 38-39.

the period between 1990 and 2000.[17] Though this may seem a large number, when set against the total number of manuscripts collections at MHS—roughly 4,000—it is not quite so substantial. The deaccessions in this ten-year period came through two processes: (1) retrospective conversion of catalog records into an OPAC and (2) the collection-by-collection review of holdings completed in 1996 for the re-definition of a documentation plan and appraisal guidelines for business records.

The retrospective cataloging project meant that the processing staff was reviewing all pre-1980 accessions. This review is, necessarily, very cursory; however, it has identified a number of collections which were clearly out of scope—from journals of a pre-Revolutionary Virginia general store to letters sent home from a Civil War soldier in a New York regiment. The holdings survey done by the two manuscript curators for the business records reassessment project identified three additional categories of potential deaccessions: (1) collections that lay not quite so far outside MHS's collecting area (for example, in Iowa and Wisconsin), (2) copies of material the originals of which (or other copies) were accessible in other repositories, and (3) material so marginal in content as not to warrant retention.

The identification of all these collections was based solely on their catalog descriptions. As candidates for deaccession were identified, they were put in a holding file until there were about two dozen of them collected. This "batching" allowed an assigned volunteer to review the actual collections, which did not always match their catalog descriptions, and check the accession files for any red flags. Restrictions, unclear titles, and identity of state or country to which the collection seemed most related were discovered and recorded through this process. The manuscript curators then reviewed the volunteer's work and did a separate examination of anything that was unclear or unusual. All of this was completed before sending a formal request for deaccessioning to the MHS acquisition committee, usually for twenty to thirty collections at a time.

Once the deaccessions were approved, the manuscript curators determined which collections were worth offering or sending to another repository and which should simply be

---

[17] Corresponding to the decade of my tenure at the society.

destroyed. The curators assisted the volunteer in identifying likely repositories for the former group, drafting transmittal letters, and shipping the material. It was surprising and gratifying to learn how frequently acknowledgments were received from the repositories, expressing delight in receiving the material. At times the donated materials connected directly to collections already in the receiving repository. Since these repositories were not necessarily expected to respond, the expressions of gratitude were considered genuine. Certainly it reinforces the contention that deaccessioning is not only a good collection management tool for the reappraising repository, but a useful tool in the broader archival mission of making historically valuable material accessible to those who would value it most.

During the period between 1990 and 2000, about eighteen collections were discovered that fit MHS's institutional criteria for deaccessioning and were thought to have significant monetary value. A very few of these collections involved material that have monetary but *not* historical value, and therefore it was expected that the administration would agree to have them consigned to an auction house for sale. The others, which have monetary *and* historical value, were left in abeyance. The manuscript curators favored offering to transfer them as outright gifts to appropriate repositories. Failing that, the curators suggested offering them at a steep discount to another repository before putting them up for public auction. In the end, however, that decision will be made by higher administration.

The process of deaccessioning at the American Heritage Center, first sketched by Mark Shelstad,[18] continues to the present, though at a slower pace. The staff is currently researching approximately seventy collections—from "archival" collections relating to United States government agencies, which may be solely government publications, to those which are probably out of scope, such as the Pacific Coast Stock Exchange—in preparation for making deaccession recommendations.

[18] Mark Shelstad, "Switching the Vacuum into Reverse," 144-146.

Conclusion

Reappraisal should be seen as "an essential, necessary and useful part of collections management"[19] for archivists, as it long has been for museum curators and librarians. It should be applied thoughtfully but willingly, knowing that, like appraisal itself, it cannot be done perfectly or in such a way as to escape all criticism. "The goal of the appraiser is to make an informed decision, not an enduringly and infallibly correct one . . . ," Gerald Ham wrote about appraisal, but it applies equally to reappraisal. "Above all, archivists should not worry once the decision is made. Remember, . . . all appraisal is a 'calculated risk.'"[20] With sound policies in place, and based on thoughtful and deliberate consideration, reappraisal, distillation, and deaccessioning are risks well worth taking.

Mark Greene is the director of the American Heritage Center at the University of Wyoming. He was curator of manuscripts acquisitions at the Minnesota Historical Society for ten years. He has published articles on archival appraisal, access to records, congressional papers, business records, and research use of archives. In 2002 he was named a Fellow of the Society of American Archivists.

---

[19] Mark Shelstad, "Switching the Vacuum into Reverse,"18.

[20] F. Gerald Ham, *Selecting and Appraising Archives and Manuscripts* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1992), 79.

Sharing Resources in the World of Downsizing: A Dialog

Susan Kienzler and Gerald F. Patout Jr.

During this age of shrinking resources and escalating demands, downsizing can affect cultural agencies as well as businesses. In the process, seemingly disparate organizations sometimes form an alliance that creates the elusive quality called synergy, which the dictionary defines as a "mutually advantageous conjunction of distinct participants or elements." The Ursuline Sisters of New Orleans Louisiana and The Historic New Orleans Collection, very different institutions that nonetheless share a commitment to documenting New Orleans and Louisiana history, established just such a conjunction when the Ursuline Sisters began refocusing their resources on their core mission in the 1990s.

The article that follows presents a dialog between representatives of those two organizations as each narrates the story of this surprising collaboration. Community Prioress Susan Kienzler, OSU (Ursuline Sisters of the Roman Order), speaks on behalf of the Ursuline Sisters, drawing on a paper she presented at a session of the 1999 meeting of the Society of American Archivists entitled "Evaluating and Maintaining Mission: A French Colonial Library and Archive Changes Hands." —The Editors

Kienzler/OSU: The history of the city of New Orleans and that of the Ursuline Sisters have been intimately bound since 1727, when twelve Ursuline Sisters arrived in New Orleans from Rouen, France. The Sisters had signed a contract with the Company of the Indies to educate the girls of the colony, as well as to care for the military hospital. Nine years after Governor Bienville founded the city, the Sisters opened a school and alternately cared for the orphans, instructed Native American and Negro students in religion, and nursed. Enrollment records were not maintained between 1727 and 1806, but since 1806 over 9,000 women have graduated from the Ursuline Academy and College. In 2002 the academy celebrated its 275th commencement, making it the oldest continuously operating girls' school in the United States.

The Sisters, competent and independent women, developed their own system of education and, like many religious communities of educators, maintained a "family business" model within the convent and the academy until the late 1970s. Both the community and the academy responded to crisis and need rather than from a plan. Funds for the school and community were often co-mingled, and large numbers of religious served as administrators and teachers.

Patout/THNOC: The impact of the Ursuline Sisters on Afro-New Orleanians and on the Catholic Church and community has been significant and manifested in many ways. Their library of books relating to almost every branch of knowledge provides evidence of the commitment of the early New Orleans Ursuline teachers to the importance of a well-rounded education. This collection also offered The Historic New Orleans Collection historical depth and a unique opportunity to enhance its already extensive holdings on early New Orleans and Louisiana education. The library collection, with published works detailing the specific methods of Ursuline education, also represented an important sample of the historic record of tradition and progress for this international and long-standing religious order.

Kienzler/OSU: In the 1970s a dramatic shift took place in many religious communities. Fewer women joined their number and Vatican Council II called for increased collaboration among the laity for the works of the church. Noticeable shifts also occurred within the New Orleans Ursuline community, propelled by both necessity and design. With a reduced number of Sisters available to serve as administrators and teachers in the academy, the community began to share authority with school boards formed to develop policy. Funds for the school and the community were separated. Decision-making became decentralized, and long-range planning became a crucial and integral component of administering the Ursuline Academy.

Awareness of the need for long-range planning affected many other areas of the community's life as well. In the early 1990s, for example, the Ursulines spent six years developing and implementing a plan for the living space of the community. However, administration of the cultural heritage of the community, which included a historical library, a museum, and an archives, was one area where planning was conspicuous by its absence. By the 1990s administration of these historic resources, which still ran on the "family business" model, had become too much for one person to handle.

Ownership and collection continued to be tremendously important, but conservation, preservation, and providing access to the collections proved to be more elusive. Because of the climate in New Orleans, our inability to attend to temperature and humidity control had serious implications for the fragile collection. In addition, technology needed to be used in the cataloguing and administration of these collections.

Gradually the challenges of caring for our cultural heritage became apparent. In 1997-1998 there were nineteen members of the Ursuline community. Approximately two-thirds of the group were retired or semi-retired. It was becoming increasingly obvious that the Sisters did not have—nor would they have in the future—the personnel or funds to properly care for their historical collections.

Charles Nolan, New Orleans archdiocesan archivist, was the first person to become aware of the gravity of the situation with the Ursuline Sisters' historical collections. In his own unique way, Dr. Nolan sowed the seeds of how we should provide proper stewardship of this valuable resource. He worked over a period of several years to increase our awareness of the priceless quality of our holdings, as well as our concomitant responsibility to ensure their preservation. As we began to implement his recommendations, he encouraged us as if these good ideas had been our own.

Our first task in moving from awareness to action was to prepare an inventory of our resources, a tedious task done by hand by the community archivist over quite a long period of time. It then became obvious that we needed to begin long-range planning for each component of our cultural heritage collection, with priority being given to the historical library. The community established a planning team that included the community archivist, the local council, a group of four sisters of the community who served as my advisors, and myself. Nolan agreed to serve as facilitator, and we are grateful for the assistance rendered by our faithful friend, consultant, and go-between throughout the process.

The community became convinced that the library needed to be preserved, as well as made accessible to scholars. Throughout the years, the Sisters had generously shared their financial and personnel resources within the New Orleans civic community. There was one major resource—the historical library—that they had not yet offered to the city. Nolan agreed to contact THNOC to see if there was any interest in these holdings.

Patout/THNOC: Perhaps one of the most significant factors that kept the process moving along and gaining momentum was the importance of communication between the parties. Certainly Charles Nolan's pivotal role in working with, as well as understanding the needs of, both parties was significant. What was learned from this councilor role and how it aided in the discussions and negotiations were invaluable to this process.

For THNOC, acquisition of the Ursuline library seemed to be an ideal match for its mission to present and interpret the history and culture of New Orleans and the Louisiana region for the benefit of the public. However, estimating the long-term costs associated with technical processing, storage, and preservation proved to be of equal importance in deciding whether to assume responsibility for this collection.

Determining the aesthetic and intrinsic value of the library, as well as how well this material actually fit into the larger context of the other collections of THNOC, took time and analysis but became an integral part of the decision-making process.

Another factor THNOC considered was the amount of physical vault space that would be needed to house this material, since the space required for this acquisition would have an impact on the long-term storage of all materials.

One of the most important administrative factors related to this acquisition was our appreciation for, and productive association with, the Ursuline community. In order to maintain this relationship and simultaneously transfer a large part of its cultural legacy to THNOC, we needed to insure that the Ursuline community was content with the terms of the acquisition and comfortable throughout the entire process.

To respond to that need, THNOC hosted a very personal behind-the-scenes tour for all of the Ursuline Sisters. This memorable day gave all the Sisters an opportunity to observe and inspect the Williams Research Center facilities, hear the staff talk about our collections, and ask important questions about our book preservation, cataloging procedures, and security measures.

Kienzler/OSU: The most significant element of the planning process occurred when all members of the planning committee toured the Williams Research Center of THNOC. Before the tour ended, each of the Sisters had mentioned to me that our books needed to be there. The community had been good stewards of these cultural resources in the past. We were equally convinced that we were exercising good stewardship in the present by choosing THNOC to serve as guardian of the collection for the future.

Patout/THNOC: In accepting the cultural legacy of the local Ursuline community, THNOC felt a special obligation to the community. Once we took possession of the library, our curators immediately set about the task of preserving this treasure trove of books and other materials. The results of exposure to termites and other paper-destroying pests over the course of many years were readily apparent. Therefore, THNOC staff took the entire collection to an off-site location for fumigation before moving any of the volumes to our research facility in the French Quarter.

THNOC had also become committed to getting these books cataloged and into OCLC in a reasonable amount of time. This was a significant undertaking in light of the cataloging backlog that already existed. Initially the library's technical processing unit met the introduction of this noteworthy collection of more than 2,000 titles with great anticipation and praise. Soon, however, the realities of the task of getting these materials cataloged and assimilated into the institution's holdings became a subject of intense discussion and much thought. After evaluating all of the available options for carrying out this responsibility, THNOC decided to contract with the OCLC TechPro Service to complete the Ursuline cataloging. Catalog records for these titles are now available through OCLC's WorldCat database.

These records clearly demonstrate the importance assigned by these teaching pioneers to their library collection. The Ursuline Sisters acquired materials that were quite controversial and worldly for the times, and many of their books touted positive and strong female role models. These books are additional testimony to the carefully-thought-out course of action that produced a tremendous historical record.

With the library acquisition now complete and the book materials cataloged and available to researchers, the next phase of the partnership between the institutions remains a collaborative effort, one that enjoys excellent cooperation and mutual progress. THNOC has microfilmed the Ursuline archives and continues to work with the community's archivist, Sr. Joan Marie Aycock, to provide an index, as well as overall improved access, to this body of records. The Collection regularly consults with the Ursuline Sisters on their museum questions and concerns and responds whenever needs arise in this area.

To really highlight and literally showcase the collaborative spirit of this acquisition, THNOC hosted a major 275th anniversary Ursuline exhibition in 2002. "A Visible Presence, A Legacy of Service: 275 Years of the Ursulines in New Orleans" combined items from the Ursuline archives and museum with a selection of the volumes now held by THNOC. This noteworthy exhibition is not only testimony to the significance of the library acquisition but also underscores the presence of the Ursulines in New Orleans over the past 275 years and their remarkable public contribution as educators of young women.

Kienzler/OSU: How does this story fit into the mission of the Ursuline Sisters in New Orleans at the beginning of the twenty-first century? The foundress of the Ursuline Sisters, St. Angela Merici, exhorted her followers, "If according to times and circumstances, the need arises to make new rules or do something differently, then do it, prudently and with good advice." Entering into a contract with THNOC was one very practical way we chose to follow our foundress' lead. A relationship has been forged that we hope will last for many years to come. It has been a rare and unique privilege to be part of a process where everyone wins.

Susan Kienzler served as the leader of the Ursuline Sisters in New Orleans during the time of the transfer of the historic library to the Historic New Orleans Collection. Currently she serves the community as the director of vocation ministry and as a member of the provincial leadership team. She resides in Cape Girardeau, Missouri, and is very active with the Catholic Campus Ministry at Southeast Missouri State University. She has a bachelor of arts degree in chemistry from the University of Missouri, St. Louis, and a masters of education degree from the University of Dayton.

Gerald F. Patout, Jr. is the head librarian at the Williams Research Center of The Historic New Orleans Collection. A native of Louisiana, he has served as the president of the Louisiana and Southern Mississippi Chapter of Special Libraries Association, a member of an advisory board for the State Library of Louisiana, and a member of the board of directors of the New Orleans-based preservation organization Save Our Cemeteries.

What a Woven Web: Archives, Websites, and the Coming Legacy of "Light Gray Literature"

Earle E. Spamer

Website content is notoriously ephemeral. Its electronic existence is in communication with its components at one moment, gone at the next. A solution to preserving that content is to "permanently archive" the entire website. This raises concerns about technological accessibility and longevity. A website can also manifest itself as a dispersed collection of printed pages and downloaded electronic files redistributed amongst the paper and electronic records of individuals and organizations. What distinguishes that which is the record of an individual or an organization from the flotsam of reprinted and hyperlinked ephemera? Are archivists preparing appraisal methods for websites and their effluent?

First, can conventional appraisal methods be applied to website content? Can or should the electronic structure of a website be "arranged" if it does not have a hierarchical structure? Does the website structure lend itself to conventional descriptive methods? Can a website even be seen to be pre-arranged and self-describing? There is no consensus; the entire matter is largely overlooked.[1]

Second, archives and manuscript collections in their traditional functions will have to address the matter of appraising, arranging, and describing material that has been extracted partially, or copied completely, from websites. Such records may be working copies for reference purposes; others may be hardcopy printouts, "archival copies" of what has been posted electronically. Records may be received either digitally or as paper printouts; the format does not matter to the principle of provenance. The context of specific sets of records may provide the distinction. The demise of the original electronic host, however, turns an accumulation of downloaded and printed records into what could be the only documentation of the content of the website, even if it is a small portion of it. Such downloaded material would have been selected for a specific reason; it is not likely to be the same as a selection made by an archivist. To further complicate an archivist's view of such records, the authenticity of material out of the original website context is suspect if it does not contain an indication of original source. Archivists will have to be-

---

[1] The research presented here is based on the author's examination of fifty journals in archives management and library science, published between 1998 and 2001. In peer-reviewed literature, there are few substantive papers that address the matter of archiving entire websites, and none that consider archiving material extracted from websites. Websites are being archived now. To compare some conceptual differences between archiving websites and preserving electronic records, see the descriptions of the Clinton White House websites archived by the National Archives and Records Administration (http://www.clinton.archives.gov) and NARA's Center for Electronic Records (http://www.archives.gov/research_room/center_for_electronic_records/about_the_center.html) that specifically archives "records designed *for* computer processing" (emphasis added here). Although the hyperlinks cited in this paper were current when the manuscript was written, by the time edited proofs were prepared six links had been modified and one website had disappeared. The links have been updated and are current as of July 2003. This example does not provide much optimism for documenting the authenticity of indexed links in archived website records. The archiving of websites has also been discussed at some length on the Archives and Archivists Listserv (to subscribe, send email to listserv@listserv.muohio.edu; in the body of the message write SUB ARCHIVES firstname lastname, or use the web interface at http://listserv.muohio.edu/archives/archives.html).

gin devising the protocols by which such records can be appraised.

Websites and archives: summation or subtraction?

Among an archive's many purposes is that it maintains the records of a single entity. In the current technological era, the contents of the official website of an organization might be properly construed as its own series of records. They result from the organization's activity of creating widely available information about it and produced by it. They are usually for public access, but parts of a website may be devoted to an organization's internal affairs. On the other hand, the website can be construed to be a single form of document, one that contains numerous sections and parts. Do records retention schedules apply to the website as a whole or to its parts? Once parts are deleted, unexpunged internal links to those parts are "dead."

Given the purpose and nature of the website, much of the information in it may be in abridged formats, selected from existing records, if not rewritten for brevity or clarity to a more public audience. Some documents might be an electronic text of a printed document or an exact facsimile of the document. A preserved "snapshot" of a website at a particular moment in time provides an arbitrary record of content and presentation, one in which selection has been determined by the creator, not the archivist.[2]

---

[2] NARA's "Clinton Presidential Materials Project" has already archived the first White House websites and made them available on its website (see note 1). Four versions (1994, 1995, 1996, and 2000) were created during the Clinton administration, each one of which was preserved. Embedded links in the websites are "dead," and not all images were provided to the National Archives. On the other hand, the National Archives' website includes functions to search all versions of the Clinton White House websites simultaneously, a kind of a finding aid unlike the serial approach of conventional finding aids. The original NARA press release (no. 01-34, 17 January 2001) is at http://www.archives.gov/media_desk/press_releases/nr01-34.html. (After this manuscript was written, NARA's website domain name was changed to www.archives.gov. Other page reassignments also made it difficult to relocate the original press release, which had been at page http://www.nara.gov/nara/pressrelease/nr01-34.html). Beyond the simple archiving of websites, already there is a hybrid website-archive that can be seen in DSpace at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. It is meant to serve both as a traditional, widely accessible website, as well as its own archive of the work of MIT faculty and researchers (http://www.dspace.org).

From the perspective of an archive, the flow of information goes in two directions in the web environment. There is information placed there by an originating entity, and there is information extracted from it by other entities. The fact that information exists on a website makes it a candidate for transfer to an archive. How to accomplish this—technologically, with assurance of temporal longevity, utilizing conventional archival procedures of arrangement and description—is a current topic open to discussion and experimentation. So far, there has been no dialogue on this matter between documents creators and archivists.

The website has an unrestricted number of contact points and contained records. It is a paradoxical kind of document (or a series), one that is composed of ephemeral information. This concept is, ironically, well suited to the purpose of an archive. On the demise of a once-widely accessible website, its component records and their relationship to each other instantly become hard to identify and acquire. Unlike the "gray literature" of limited- and special-distribution documents and serials, so often difficult to locate even in their multiple copies, the electronic records of decimated and extinct websites are even more ephemeral—"light gray literature."

This is different from individual record loss or omission through selection in traditional archives and manuscript collections. Once disconnected from the web, the content of a website may still exist in one place (in an archive), but it is less likely to be accessed through the World Wide Web. Its pages will also be pocked by broken links and absent images. But even if the website were never archived and is utterly gone, it may yet exist as a constellation of randomly excised digital files and printouts lacking the perspective of original arrangement, fascicles of uncertain authenticity scattered through other archives and manuscript collections.

ARCHIVING WEBSITES

A set of authentic website records, electronically preserved as created and used by an organization, is the best means of verifying the form and function of the website.[3] But some administrators of an organization may tend to see the website as a means *to* archive information, with the fiscally driven good intention that if records are placed there, openly and widely available, it is cost-effective and inferentially long-lived.

Appraisal techniques might be confounded if a website contains borrowed material for which sources are neither documented nor credible. This may be a perceived problem only until standard methodologies are devised for appraising information contained in, and derived from, websites.[4] Sampling is not likely to be a satisfactory method of appraisal and accession. In fact, a selection of records that are a part of a website would seem to be contrary to the purpose of a website that is itself a selection of records.

A website may include evidential information, posted there as a means of making the information available widely and electronically. Such evidential data should already exist in other formal or legally sanctioned formats, as paper documents or as separately stored electronic files. The utility of having some evidential data available on a website may be a matter of convenience. So the primary purpose of archiving the content of a website is to preserve the informational aspects conveyed by its selective content and by the manner in which it was presented. This is an important criterion, one which archivists will have to take into consideration when appraising the content of a website, if the website is to be retained in "snapshot" format. One opin-

---

[3] Hardware and software obsolescence, and data migration to new media, are ignored here. These are important issues, but they are technology-dependent ones, the funding for which is an administrative issue. And if there is anything archivists have learned in the past forty years, looking back at how technology was seen and used can be supercilious. Forty years hence, current limitations should be no surprise.

[4] The matter has roots in cataloging and processing of electronic materials, in areas as diverse as classification terminology of web-based resources (e.g., Carol Jean Gody and Ray Reighart, "Terminology Identification in a Collection of Web Resources," *Journal of Internet Cataloging* 4 (2000): 49-65) to attempts to apply bibliographical description techniques to electronic resources (e.g., J. McRee Elrod, "Classification of Internet Resources: An AUTOCAT Discussion," *Cataloging and Classification Quarterly* 29 (2000): 19-38).

ion on the Archives Listserv summed up the predicament and process well: "View the web site as a business process, capture the information that most completely describes it[;] but who wants to keep an invoice forever[?]."[5]

There is a further element of subjectivity in a website, that of presentation. Depending upon the creativity and resources of a website's managers and operators, its content and presentation can range from a mundane, monochromatic posting of text documents, to a lively, colorful, complex series of interactive pages.[6] There may not be an understanding of how it was created or by whom.

The National Archives of Australia has established policies and procedures regarding the archiving of Commonwealth government public websites and its internal "webs" and "nets" of shared information and communicated documents.[7] Its procedures include not only the documentation of provenance and matters that fulfill legislative and fiduciary requirements, but they also provide direction for maintaining "records of web resource production and maintenance" and records retention appraisals. In addition, the directives specify that agencies must define and maintain a level of web-based recordkeeping that is adequate for its purposes.

The concept of *an* archive and archiv-*ing* is blurring. This is less of a conceptual misunderstanding than it is a reflection of how technological resources are used by people who are increasingly "information literate." Because information skills are increasing, the overall improvement of information literacy brings

---

[5] Archives Listserv, http://listserv.muohio.edu/archives/archives.html, Chris Flynn, 25 June 2002, responding to an inquiry from Marty Firestein, subject "Archiving websites."

[6] Michael J. Albers points out that "Web pages are no longer simple handcrafted text objects, but dynamic groupings of text assembled moments before the reader views the page." Michael J. Albers, "The Technical Editor and Document Databases: What the Future May Hold," *Technical Communication Quarterly* 9 (2000): 191. While this may be true for many websites, many more are of the "mundane" sort. It is the more complex, "dynamic" kind that will be more susceptible to technological decay and inaccessibility in an archived state, at best reduced to raw text.

[7] National Archives of Australia, "Archiving Websites," http://www.naa.gov.au/recordkeeping/er/web_records/intro.html and http://www.naa.gov.au/recordkeeping/rkpubs/advices/advice43.html.

to the field of archival management a similar approval of, and confidence in, the application of technology in what not so long ago was very much a hand-driven, hand-arranged system.

This is all well and good for considering the future of work in archives. Yet although the broad value of archiving website-based information is recognized, there is not yet an equally broad response as to how to make it a part of archival methods. Some very large government organizations have accomplished it in some measure. By no means is website archiving moving ahead at the same pace as web resources are accumulating. The website is increasingly used as a means to make available, as much as possible, large subsets of an organization's records. Some kinds of records are unique to the website, susceptible to extinction without ever having had the chance for archival appraisal. This is a disheartening, disproportionate view of the potential for the website as a tool for archives management and as a source of archival information.

Website debris: archival or not?

Posting documents on a website makes them available. This is electronic document-management, outbound to users; it is different from managing documents coming to an archive. Posted documents do not ensure permanence, nor do they relate to an archive's purpose to make it possible for users to find sets of associated information. There also is no way of determining how many versions, revisions, abridgements, and copies exist. For a given document, too, users copy portions for their own use or redistribution. Some subset of such material may be records of the creator that are available nowhere else, but there is a great deal of website-based material that has been reposted from other sources. Source citations may be present in a document, but digital copies of documents with no embedded source line have little more acknowledgement than the date on which they were copied. On pages printed from the Web, many printing programs add a banner line citing the source's URL. On these banners a long URL is sometimes interrupted by an ellipsis, rendering the source citation useless. Certification that the material is unedited is almost never indicated. Copyright issues are dismissed as easily as they are acknowledged.

These are ethical issues, as well as procedural and legal ones. A large amount of material exists *as if* it belongs to the body of literature and resources in the public domain. Arranging records so derived from websites as a series of its own provides a logically descriptive set, but one that might be ignorant of the creators and arrangement.

NEW ARCHIVAL ISSUES RELATING TO WEBSITES

Electronic records have been concerns for archivists for some time. Now that archivists have to embrace website-based records—from downloaded individual web pages to entire websites—new concerns arise. Digitization of records has altered the ways in which basic research is done, now including the use of web-based resources. Primary sources are currently available widely, where once they were exclusively the domain of archives and (less frequently) published edited collections. Some organizations strive to meet this need by creating ways to make "unique" resources more available. For example, Rutgers University Libraries' Scholarly Communication Center is a web-based outlet created to "publish unique information sources on the Web that are not likely to be published elsewhere."[8]

There are shared-document "webs" and "nets" used internally by organizations. Their purposes are specific to the functions of the organization. Public websites, however, may contain many different kinds of records. Records with evidential and informational value are mixed. These records are widely accessible, copied and printed. Because of this, copyright and other intellectual-property issues are of significant concern to archivists.

The Society of American Archivists (SAA) first established its position on electronic documents in March 1995.[9] The position statement focuses on records that have been transmitted electronically; presumably this encompasses website-based data since in order to retrieve such records they must be transmitted

---

[8] Ronald C. Jantz, "Providing Access to Unique Information Resources: A Reusable Platform for Publishing Bibliographical Databases on the Web," *Library Hi-Tech* 18 (2000): 28. For a description of the Rutgers initiative, see Boyd Collins et al., *Building a Scholarly Communications Center: Modeling the Rutgers Experience* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1999).

[9] Society of American Archivists, "Archival Issues Raised by Information Stored in Electronic Form," *Archival Outlook* (May 1995), text also available at http://www.archivists.org/governance/handbook/app_j10.asp.

electronically. The SAA stated: "Electronic communications that are created, stored, or transmitted through electronic mail systems in the normal course of activities are records." They held the position that archivists should have authority to "determine the long-term value of [these] records" and that "significant changes in record keeping policies" are needed to retain and preserve these records.

In August 1997 the SAA provided a commentary on the management of intellectual property in the digital environment.[10] The comments responded to a National Humanities Alliance (NHA) statement, "Basic Principles for Managing Intellectual Property in the Digital Environment." The purpose of the SAA's commentary was to reinforce the positions of the NHA statement from the perspective of archives; it is not a critique or a reassessment of it. In February 1999 the SAA issued a statement on copyright issues relating to electronically distributed archival documents.[11] Together, these positions demonstrate that archivists are not "in the dark" about the important issues of ownership and authenticity of electronically derived records.

The authenticity of web-based documents that have been copied or downloaded from another source is compromised. Even web search-and-download processes have been dramatically automated. Commercial products are available for this purpose too. A standard methodology of research is the idea that working from original materials can withstand challenges raised regarding the materials' authenticity. The electronic environment lends itself all too easily to re-editing, substitution of materials out of context, and unacknowledged inclusion of other source materials.[12] The matter relates to textual and graphic materials alike, and further, to anything that is digitally recorded. The

[10] Society of American Archivists, "Basic Principles for Managing Intellectual Property in the Digital Environment: An Archival Perspective," http://www.archivists.org/governance/handbook/app_j4.asp.

[11] Society of American Archivists, "Statement on Copyright Issues for Archives in Distance Education," http://www.archivists.org/statements/distance_education.asp.

[12] See for example, Stephen Enniss, "The Role of the Artifact in a Facsimile Age," *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts and Cultural Heritage* 1 (2000): 46-47.

opportunities for fabrication are limitless. For this reason, archives are best suited to serve as they always have, to arrange and preserve records that document its organization's activities. Because of an organization's internal control over its website, all such records carry a cachet of authenticity. The incorporation of copied or printed website documents into an archive is acceptable in the same manner as if they were manuscript materials, at the face value of those documents. Appraisal and arrangement procedures will apply. Impropriety will have to be addressed in the same fashion as would prevail if unauthentic or forged records were discovered in a paper-based archive. The medium should not be cause for administrative consternation.

As for the matter of archiving an entire website, it is the purest form of appraisal for an organization's archive to perform, even if the hypertext components are degraded by dead links and missing graphics. An organization's website is, to a point, pre-arranged and self-describing, a ready-made series of records (if not a single document containing many parts).

Copyright is a problematical consideration even in traditional environments of documents and records, particularly in manuscript collections. The problems were exacerbated when these concerns were applied to what was a non-traditional world of electronic records and communication. Now they are applied in a world that, for the most part, sees electronic records as equals of written records, but which is still grappling with the legalities of distribution. Numerous issues relating to web and other electronic copyrights are regularly discussed. A good summary by Charles Oppenheim[13] takes special note of the ease of copying and redistributing documents on the Web. He points out that there is a huge amount of unwanted linking to other web pages too that lays them open to copyists and downloaders, human and virtual alike. He suggests that copyright is "unlikely to survive in its present form."

FROM HERE, WHERE?

Everything that is usual in appraisal, accession, arrangement, description, and all matters of security and user services

---

[13] Charles Oppenheim, "Does Copyright Have Any Future on the Internet?" *Journal of Documentation* 57 (2000): 279-298.

is affected by the electronic environment. Archivists and data managers have been so dazzled by the processes, abilities, and economy of the Internet that they have rushed headlong to embrace it. As technology changes, the records are migrated to newer media and reformatted to remain readable–maybe. As Luciana Duranti opined on the understated but precise term "contemporary records," the missions and functions of archives, and the work and methods of archivists, will require some role changes.[14]

There is much to consider. A now-dated but usefully annotated "Bibliography on Electronic Records" lists many references that are applicable to management and duties of archives.[15] It supplements a 1993 annotated bibliography on the same subject by Richard J. Cox.[16] Together, these sources are a good historical introduction, showing the depth of work already done by 1996 in coming to terms with many problems of electronically created and distributed records. These works document a long period during which professional opinion, experimentation, and arbitration established the archivist's role in the management of electronic records. They model the process that can be followed to devise ways by which to professionally

---

[14] Luciana Duranti, "Meeting the Challenge of Contemporary Records: Does It Require a Role Change for the Archivist?" *American Archivist* 63 (2000): 7-14.

[15] Kimberly Barata, "Bibliography on Electronic Records," in *Functional Requirements for Evidence in Recordkeeping* (University of Pittsburgh, School of Information Sciences[SIS]). The lengthy bibliography is divided into thirteen sections, including theory, principles, and various issues of legal and professional practices. The bibliography had been posted on the SIS website at http://www.lis.pitt.edu/~nhprc/bibtc.html (last modified September 1996). In May 2002 the link was discovered to be a bad one, and the bibliography seemed to have been deleted from the website altogether. A recent search on the "Wayback Machine" of archived websites, accessible through www.archive.org, has relocated the missing bibliography at
http://web.archive.org/web/19991128184609/www.sis.pitt.edu/~nhprc/bibtc.html.

[16] Richard J. Cox, "Readings in Archives and Electronic Records: Annotated Bibliography and Analysis of the Literature," in *Electronic Records Management Program Strategies*, ed. M. Hedstrom (Pittsburgh: Archives and Museum Informatics, 1993): 99-156.

evaluate and manage websites and website-derived records transferred to the archive.

Archiving a website is really not much of a problem beyond the technical resources needed to retain it for continued use, even if it is no more than a collection of hyperlinked records. Keeping up with the technology is more of an issue for administrators; it is they who manage the funding and staff to continue certain practices. The challenge for the archivist is how to describe what is in that website. "Arrangement" is likely to be a fruitless (even futile) task. The nature of hyperlinks can preclude a sequential order to files. Series, as understood by archivists, may not exist in some websites. A website may also be a series unto itself, one with no orderly "folder list"!

Although files on a website will likely be listed by the creator in some kind of browsable fashion (but such a list may not have been created in the first place), access to the files can be gained from many *different* places on the website, as well as from anywhere on the Internet. Just how the website's creator organized and maintained the site will determine what, if any, kind of arrangement is discernible or not. Perhaps the simplest solution is to print out the site map as a finding aid of sorts. Of course, it will not show files that are nested within these first-level hyperlinks (akin to sub-series). If no site map exists, the archivist will have to be creative. Pragmatically there is not likely to be enough time to follow each link and all of its embedded links to exhaustion. And where does one stop? One step, or many steps, can end at a single document, and document-level control is not the principle objective of arrangement. Cross-linking to and from different places on the website makes it impossible to discern "subseries" within top-level links; some of them may be single documents too. It should be enough to summarize the website contents in a general description, leaving the navigation to the researcher or other archive patron. The best thing about this kind of environment is that the archivist need not fret about folders being inadvertently mixed, and concerns of theft or careless handling are practically moot points!

The issue of appraising and arranging downloaded and printed website records can be made easy or difficult. As with any photocopied materials that are contained in an individual's or organization's records, the same general principles can be applied. All such materials may be treated as if they were a collection of research materials to which a variety of copyright issues apply.

Unlike the photocopy, which inferentially means that the original or multiple identical copies may yet exist elsewhere, a downloaded web page may be unique if its website host has been switched off and not archived. The archivist may never know, nor should it be the archivist's job to find out. A new kind of reference service may come into being to meet the need to determine the "scarceness" of all of this light gray literature, a union list of sorts based upon URLs and document titles.[17] Surely these can be worked into encoded archival description (EAD) environments—accessible on a website, of course—and time will provide for the ultimate decision of whether or not such a service is practical and useful. Until a better realization is held of the volume of such material included in archived records, and until a better understanding is had of the intentions of records creators when they download web-based records, it may be better to err for a while on the side of conservatism, retaining more than what normally would be retained.

Perhaps just once in a generation archivists are in a position to establish standards by which a whole new technology and its records are treated. Now is that time.

Earle Spamer is archivist in the Ewell Sale Stewart Library of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia, where he is also managing editor of scientific publications. He has worked in the curation of natural history research collections for thirty years, compiled the web-based "Bibliography of the Grand Canyon and the Lower Colorado River," published in several fields of history and science, and served as a contributing editor to the *Annals of Improbable Research*, where his work has also been translated into German, Italian, and Chinese.

[17] A "Bibliographic Object Name Resolver Service" is used within the University of Michigan's Humanities Text Initiative website, http://www.hti.umich.edu. For SGML documents posted there, bibliographical information is provided, complete with its URL fully spelled out, with verification that it is a persistent URL. Although this is for printed works that have been digitally scanned and made available through the Web, a comparable listing might be desirable for URLs themselves.

Archival Donor Relations and Development: Keeping a Balance

Carla M. Summers

One of the central pleasures of archival work is developing relationships with donors of materials. These people are extraordinary and their activities have changed society. Donors of materials in the author's experience have included an artist whose journals capture the development of a creative vision for his work and his teaching, a famous broadcaster lively only when the microphone was on, politicians who have made great sacrifices to be of service but found great rewards, a famous writer who regards his manuscripts as a bank account he can draw on in his old age, farmers working to preserve the family farm in the face of the onslaught of agribusiness, and landscape architects who balance the natural environment and population growth in Florida. Because archivists are so adept at building relationships, one would assume that fundraising would come naturally. But archivists may shy away from asking for money because doing so might alienate donors and discourage them from donating their papers.

Despite these concerns and an understandable uneasiness about asking for money, the possibility of a strain on relationships with donors pales in significance beside the other challenges facing archival repositories. These challenges include the expense of processing voluminous twentieth-century collections and the paucity of funding available for that purpose. Archivists have little choice but to embrace the art of development. This article addresses three of the significant challenges facing archivists who wish to develop outside funding for their programs.

- How to understand the work of development in order to influence its outcome, to become what has been called "donor literate."[1]
- How to find revenue sources to fund processing the abundance of late twentieth-century collections.
- How to stop entrepreneurial collecting by university administrators and faculty that benefits other areas of the university at the expense of the archives.

BECOMING DONOR-LITERATE

Several publications provide helpful guidance on becoming "donor literate."[2] A good place to start is *Managing Archival and Manuscripts Repositories*, a part of the Society of American Archivists' Archival Fundamental Series, which has a chapter called "Fund Raising and Development" by Thomas Wilstead and William Nolte.[3] Wilstead and Nolte point out that archivists have a natural affinity for working with donors because the professional work of selecting, appraising, and accessioning manuscript materials is very similar to the work of development. Both identify potential donors through friends and faculty. The

---

[1] Charlene Clark, "Donor and Donor Relations," in *Raising Money for Academic and Research Libraries: A How-To-Do-It Manual for Libraries*, ed. Barbara I. Dewey (New York: Neal-Schuman Publications, Inc., 1991), 27.

[2] Many sources can be found at the web site of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education, http://www.case.org/default.cfm. Victoria Steele's "The Role of Special Collections in Library Development," in *Library Fundraising, Models for Success* (Chicago and London: American Library Association, 1995), 72-84, is considered a seminal article in library development.

[3] Thomas Wilsted and William Nolte, "Fundraising and Development," in *Managing Archival and Manuscript Repositories* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1991), 69-78.

difference, of course, is that in development the focus is on the donor's ability to contribute rather than on the significance of his or her contribution. Once someone is identified as a possible donor, the approach for both development and archives collecting is carefully planned. In *Selecting and Appraising Archives and Manuscripts*, Gerald Ham talks about finding "the proper gauge armament to bring down the quarry" when going after collections.[4] Similarly, in development it makes sense to ask the university president, deans, or wealthy friends of the university to approach wealthy potential donors of money. Negotiations leading to the donation of funds cover the same ground as conversations leading to the donation of personal papers—affirming the importance of the donation, creating a lasting legacy, and matching the individual's interests to the interests of the university and the scholarly community.

At the heart of these negotiations is a contract that archivists call the deed of gift and development officers call the gift agreement.[5] Successful negotiations match the institution's needs to the donor's abilities and wishes. When archivists negotiate a deed of gift, they stand in for all the generations to come who will use the materials. When development officers negotiate a gift agreement, they stand in for all the generations who will benefit from sponsored scholarship. Both archivists and development officers work to limit restrictions and recognize ownership, and both see the fulfillment of the requirements of these contracts as good stewardship to the donor and their constituents.

The university setting offers many opportunities to learn more about development. Archivists can become donor-literate by becoming active in the ubiquitous library friends group or by getting involved with United Way-type community campaigns. Such participation provides necessary experience in planning events and asking for donations. The best way to become more donor-literate, however, is to work with a library development officer. Like archivists, development officers are professionals,

---

[4] F. Gerald Ham, *Selecting and Appraising Archives and Manuscripts* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1993), 43.

[5] Robert M. Marovich, "Securing a Wise Agreement," *Currents*, Council for Advancement and Support of Education (November/December 2000): 36.

and working with a good one can be the best training.[6] Perhaps the most important things development officers can teach archivists are the mechanisms of moving a financial donor to the stage of actually giving money. Initially, development officers concentrate on determining whether an individual might be a potential donor. To do this they will talk to peers of the prospect and do research to determine if there is a capability to give. If there is, they will arrange an opportunity to visit with the prospect to gauge her or his interest and to get to know the prospect better. The development officer might also ask the potential donor to help in the development of a proposal. After the initial visit, an invitation is extended for the prospective donor to visit the repository for a tour, exhibit, or activity. The relationship with the financial donor is seen as an ongoing conversation, and throughout this process the donor should regard the development officer or archivist as a peer.

Part of becoming donor-literate is understanding that university libraries are "constituency-challenged."[7] Libraries and archives in university settings are without a ready pool of potential financial donors because universities manage competition for funding by controlling who is allowed to approach individuals. Administrators determine within which unit of the university a potential financial donor has been most closely affiliated, and contact with that donor is then limited to that unit. Unfortunately, former students are not identified as being affiliated with the library, and therefore the library is denied the opportunity to request funds from most alumni.

Becoming donor-literate also means recognizing all the levels of competition for the private dollar—among institutions, between units within the university, and between competing needs within units. Many types of not-for-profits court the same funding sources as universities. Within the university, the library is competing with sponsored research that can be com-

---

[6] A recent article in *Library Trends* reported that for every $3-5 million to be raised, organizations need one professional director of development. To make money in development an institution has to spend money on specialized staff, travel, and other expenses. Susan K. Martin, "Academic Library Fund-Raising: Organization, Process and Politics," *Library Trends* 48, no. 3 (Winter 2000): 567-568.

[7] Ibid., 569.

mercially profitable and with university athletics that can offer tremendous advertising opportunities for sponsors. While the archives can be a focal point, a "jewel in the crown," it does not tend to be the focus of development efforts. Within the library there are also many competing needs. The named-book endowment is one of the most common fundraising strategies, and it is often a challenge to convince administrators that manuscript processing could have similar appeal to financial donors. Only two library directors of the ninety-nine who responded to an Association of Research Libraries' Research Collections Committee survey evaluating special collections programs reported development officers devoted exclusively to special collections.[8]

To make money in development, the archives must spend money on gifts and event costs. Because university libraries lack a constituency and face fierce competition for funding, they must create a constituency among the next generation of alumni through programs such as open houses, gifts such as sport bottles with archives and library logos, and archives' sponsorship of concerts or other high-profile student events. This kind of development is "casting bread upon the water," and its generosity should yield results for the next generation of archivists.

Archives also need to draw upon their relationships with other areas of the university. For example, academic units could be asked to "tithe" a few good prospects in recognition of the value of the archives to the scholarly life of the community. Libraries could approach successful fundraisers, such as athletic associations, about receiving a percentage of the money raised through televised games or other windfalls, or ask academic units to take the step of earmarking a percentage of funds raised to support the archives.

Building a case for funding

For many archives and manuscript repositories, the great expense of processing abundant and voluminous late

---

[8] Judith M. Panitch, *Special Collections in ARL Libraries, Results of the 1998 Survey Sponsored by the ARL Research Collections Committee* (Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries, 2001), 53.

twentieth-century collections drives the need for increased development.[9] Archives function in the market economy and are not above its constraints, but they are not for profit. Repositories purchase goods and services in the market place, have seen the expansion of costs, and struggle to maintain their productivity; but they still do not collect a fee at the reading-room door or design cost-recovery mechanisms for collections delivered by the Internet. Donors of collections are unaware of the expenses associated with processing manuscript collections and providing for their preservation needs. Administrators balance the needs of the archives with other pressing concerns. Indeed, one of the greatest things to come from the evaluation of the need for private money may be an increase in support from our own institutions. One way to communicate our needs is to articulate clearly the nature of the difficulties we face.

The federal government creates some of the fastest growing collections, and within the last decade some universities holding political collections have started endowments to support them. There is a long history of governments' turning their functions over to universities, including basic research and acculturating our young. The government subsidies received by most universities, however, are not sufficient to support these assigned functions. Collections of members of Congress are poster children for the information explosion. They are a classic example of mandates legislated but not funded. The huge volume of the collections hides the significant records, and the collections continue to grow.

By designating the papers of its members as private, Congress delegates a tremendous responsibility to individual members and to diverse public and private repositories, yet there is no government granting agency that will provide money to help process them.[10] Because responsibility for caring for congres-

---

[9] Libraries' greatest need is funding to cover the cost of processing, but it is difficult to raise money for this kind of nuts-and-bolts work. As a result, funds not earmarked for any specific purpose are the most likely to go to manuscript processing.

[10] The few government agencies that fund archives are narrowing the foci of their programs. It is far easier to get funding for preservation projects or electronic records projects than for basic, but essential, processing, and it is extremely difficult to get funding for processing congressional collections.

sional papers is distributed, there are no collection strategies for state delegations, regions, or the nation as a whole. There are no electronic records consortia for congressional papers and no support for activism to save these records of the great issues of the century.

The political collections held by two southern universities illustrate the fundraising challenge these archives face. The two institutions hold a total of nine collections from the United States Senate, twenty-one from the United States House, and nine gubernatorial collections. These collections comprise a total of 6,402 cubic feet. They have processed 1,590 cubic feet, or 25 percent, leaving 4,812 cubic feet unprocessed. If they set a goal of processing this backlog over a ten-year period, they would need to process 481 cubic feet per year. Using Paul Ericksen and Robert Shuster's estimate that it requires 15.1 hours to process one cubic foot, this rate of processing equates to 7,266 hours of staff time.[11] If the repositories were able to hire graduate students at a rate of $10 per hour, the labor cost alone would be $72,661 per year. If endowments were yielding 5 percent a year, the universities would have to raise a total of $1.5 million in order to generate a sufficient yearly income to cover the student labor.[12] In addition, the repositories would need to purchase supplies and provide supervision.

Dedicated effort is required for this level of fundraising. Archivists should consider enlisting previous donors or high-profile users for assistance in asking new donors to fund the processing of their collections. Repositories might establish friends groups and set high, tax-deductible membership fees or organize $500-per-plate dinners featuring dignitaries and celebrities. Part of the battle is increasing the notice and profile of the repository. Archives sponsorship of the activities of other high profile not-for-profits (e.g., presses or public radio) and glossy publications highlighting collections in areas of special interest

---

[11] Paul Ericksen and Robert Shuster, "Beneficial Shocks: The Place of Processing Cost Analysis in Archival Administration," *American Archivist* 58 (Winter 1995): 32-52.

[12] The author thanks Herbert Hartsook, University of South Carolina, and Katherine I. Mainardis, University of Wyoming, for sharing information about their repositories. The University of South Carolina and the University of Florida provided the numbers cited in this section.

(e.g., gardening, design, or other disciplines documented in the collections) can help to attract attention. Naming opportunities for symposiums, buildings, and publications satisfy a donor's desire for recognition, while supporting the work and goals of the repository.

In addition, development activities should include attention to a special area in development known as stewardship. Stewardship is the relationship after the gift. Most archives stay in touch with the people and organizations donating collections. They recognize the gift publicly, thank the donor formally, and keep him or her informed about significant events related to the collection. In the development arena, stewardship can be enhanced by promoting sponsored projects through web sites tracking their progress or through advertisements in a local paper thanking all types of donors for their support.

ENTREPRENEURIAL COLLECTING

Not only are archives without a constituency, but administrators at all levels of the university use the archives as an incentive to raise money for other parts of the institution. From faculty members, to library development officers, all the way up to the university president, representatives of the university are leaning across the dinner table and saying: "Give us your money and the archives will take your papers." University development officers and administrators do not understand the impact of these promises on their special collections departments. Their focus is on finding money for scholarships or curing pediatric AIDS.

To stem entrepreneurial collecting by the university, the library must educate the university community about the importance of building archival and manuscript collections in focused areas to support the institution's strengths and academic programs and about the inherent costs in accepting new collections. Development activities, like preservation, the systems office, the digital library, and the archives, should serve the broader vision of the collection development policy. Clear-cut policies circulated throughout the university can support setting boundaries with prospective donors. Archivists should be able to describe and explain their expenses and make clear how the archives contributes to the rest of the community. The library director plays a crucial role in fund-raising for the academic library, and her or his support of collection development goals and ability to define boundaries for the library will do much to stop entrepreneurial collecting.

When entrepreneurial collecting cannot be avoided, archivists can make the best of the situation. They can practice rigid appraisal standards in the face of charming and powerful donors and write proactive deeds of gifts that allow for destruction and reformatting as needed. Archivists can take advantage of the new relationship occasioned by the donation of papers and ask these donors for money to help support their collection.

In the beginning, archives development may feel like a faith-based initiative. In his article, "Donor Relations as Public Relations: Toward a Philosophy of Fund-Raising," Robert Wedgeworth notes: "[T]he process of creating and maintaining relationships is at the heart of any successful fund-raising campaign."[13] It is archivists' ability to maintain relationships with donors, an ability developed through collection-solicitation programs, that makes them great fund-raisers. Archivists' most immediate and basic imperative is to collect objectively and soundly. In the face of the increasing size of twentieth-century collections and decreasing sources of public funding, archivists must also become experts in development. Through development, we enhance our curatorial stewardship by fostering new partnerships for managing our cultural heritage.

Carla M. Summers, formerly chief manuscripts librarian at the University of Florida, is now head of the Department of Special Collections at the University of Central Florida Libraries.

---

[13] Robert Wedgeworth, "Donor Relations as Public Relations: Towards a Philosophy of Fund-Raising," *Library Trends* 48, no. 3 (Winter 2000): 536.

INFORMATION FOR CONTRIBUTORS

David B. Gracy II Award

A one-hundred dollar prize will be presented annually to the author of the best article in *Provenance*. Named after David B. Gracy II, founder and first editor of *Georgia Archive* (the precursor of *Provenance*), the award began in 1990 with volume VIII. It is judged by members of *Provenance*'s editorial board.

Editorial Policy

Members of the Society of Georgia Archivists, and others with professional interest in the aims of the society, are invited to submit manuscripts for consideration and to suggest areas of concern or subjects which they feel should be included in forthcoming issues of *Provenance*.

Manuscripts and related correspondence should be addressed to Susan G. Broome, Mercer University, Jack Tarver Library, 1300 Edgewood Avenue, Macon, GA 31207–0001. Telephone: 478–301–2968. Fax: 478–301–5494. E-mail: broome_sg@mercer.edu.

Review materials and related correspondence should be sent to Reviews Editor, Chuck Barber, Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Main Library, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602–1641. Telephone: 706-542–7123. Fax: 706–542–4144. E-mail: cbarber@libris.libs.uga.edu.

An editorial board appraises submitted manuscripts in terms of appropriateness, scholarly worth, and clarity of writing.

Accepted manuscripts will be edited in the above terms and to conform to *The Chicago Manual of Style*, 15th edition.

Contributors submit manuscripts with the understanding that they have not been submitted simultaneously for publication to any other journal. Only manuscripts which have not been previously published will be accepted, and authors must agree not to publish elsewhere, without explicit written permission, a paper submitted to and accepted by *Provenance.*

Two complimentary copies of *Provenance* will be provided to the author; reviewers receive two tear-sheets.

Letters to the editor which include pertinent and constructive comments or criticisms of articles or reviews recently published by *Provenance* are welcome. Ordinarily, such letters should not exceed 300 words.

Manuscript Requirments

Manuscripts (four printed copies) should be submitted in double-spaced typescripts throughout—including footnotes at the end of the text—on white bond paper 8 ½-x-11 inches in size. Margins should be about 1 ½ inches all around. All pages should be numbered, including the title page. The author's name and address should appear only on the title page, which should be separate from the main text of the manuscript.

Once an article is accepted, authors should provide a copy of their manuscript on diskette (IBM compatible, in unformatted ASCII preferred).

Text, references, and footnotes should conform to copyright regulations and to accepted scholarly standards. This is the author's responsibility. *Provenance* uses *The Chicago Manual of Style*, 15th edition, and *Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language*, 3d edition (G. & C. Merriam, Co.) as its standard for style, spelling, and punctuation.

Use of terms which have special meaning for archivists, manuscripts curators, and records managers should conform to the definitions in Lewis J. Bellardo and Lynn Lady Bellardo, compilers, *A Glossary for Archivists, Manuscripts Curators, and Records Managers* (Chicago: SAA, 1992). Copies of this glossary may be purchased from the Society of American Archivists, 527 S. Wells Street, 5th Floor, Chicago, IL 60607.

2002 Officers of the Society of Georgia Archivists

President
Susan E. Dick
Georgia Historical Society

Vice-President/President Elect
Nancy Davis Bray
Georgia College and State University

Secretary
Jill Severn
University of Georgia

Treasurer
Jill Swiecichoski
United Parcel Service

Past President
Susan G. Broome
Mercer University

Archivist
Laura Botts
Georgia Music Hall of Fame

Director (2001–2002)
Glenn Eskew
Georgia State University

Director (2002–2003)
Sara Saunders
Atlanta History Center

Newsletter Editor
Lamonica Sanford
The Herndon Home

Newsletter Associate Editor
Miriam Hudgins
Mercer University

Web Editor
Pamela Coleman
Georgia Division of
Archives and History

Administrative Assistant
Linda Davis
Columbia Theological
Seminary

SGA

Provenance

Journal of the Society of Georgia Archivists
ISSN 0739–4241

P.O. Box 133085, Atlanta, Georgia 30333